

# COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

JANUARY, 1945      CONTENTS      VOL. IV, NO. 2

---

Henri Focillon, 1881-1943	GEORGE KUBLER	71
The War and Mediaeval Art	CHARLES R. MOREY	75
The Effect of the War on Renaissance and Baroque Art in Italy	RENSSELAER W. LEE	81
Furlough in Rome	HEINZ H. THANNHAUSER	92
On the Desirability of a Print Collection for a College	ULRICH MIDDELDORF	96
Obituaries		
Thomas B. Jeffery	BERNARD C. HEYL	106
Erling C. Olsen	KARL LEHMANN	107
Heinz H. Thannhauser	H.R.H.	108
News Reports		109
Book Reviews: William Colgate, <i>Canadian Art, Its Origin and Development</i> (R. H. HUBBARD); Talbot Hamlin, <i>Greek Revival Architecture in America</i> (DIMITRIS TSELOS); Leo van Puyvelde, <i>The Dutch Drawings in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle</i> (AGNES MONGAN); Alan Priest, <i>Chinese Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art</i> (JOHN A. POPE); Gisela M. A. Richter, <i>Kouroi, A Study of the Development of the Greek Kouros</i> (GEORGE E. MYLONAS); Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, <i>Russian Icons and Objects of Ecclesiastical and Decorative Arts from the Collection of George R. Hann</i> (WOLFGANG BORN)		112
Books Received		124

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

**GEORGE KUBLER** is Assistant Professor of History of Art at Yale University, Editor of the *ART JOURNAL*, and a specialist in Latin American art and archaeology. He was a pupil of Henri Focillon at Yale.

**CHARLES R. MOREY** is Marquand Professor of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University, a member of the Mediaeval Academy of America, the Archaeological Institute of America, and the American Philosophical Society, author of many books and articles on early Christian and mediaeval art. He is at present Vice-Chairman of the Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas.

**RENSSELAER W. LEE** is a Professor of History of Art at Smith College now spending half time at Northampton and half time at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. Until recently he was Editor of the *ART BULLETIN*. At present he is Executive Secretary of the Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas.

**HEINZ H. THANNHAUSER** was an Instructor of Art at Newcomb College and later a sergeant in the U. S. Army Air Corps. Last summer he was killed in action. An obituary notice appears in this issue.

**ÜLRICH MIDDELDORF** is chairman of the Department of Art at the University of Chicago and Honorary Curator of Sculpture at the Art Institute. A specialist in Renaissance art, he is a connoisseur of drawings and prints.

## HENRI FOCILLON, 1881-1943

*Vir incredibili multarum rerum cognitione insignis*

THE death of Henri Focillon on March 3, 1943, induced a lasting sensation of loss among his friends, colleagues, and students. The loss is the more vivid because he died in this country, remaining at work virtually until his last moments. A recent volume (*Moyen Age: Survivances et Réveils*) was prepared during his illness, as well as the greater part of an unpublished book dealing with the events of the year 1000. At the same time he gave vigorous support to the French cause in America, and directed the efforts of his students, without sparing his own energies. In illness he remained the exemplary and stimulating thinker of the days of his more robust health.

His part in the development of an international and polymathic history of art was recognized in many countries long before the present war. The host of pupils; the institutes he founded in Europe and America; and the path-breaking written work are at present his memorial. His compatriots claimed him among the most representative products of French culture, but his other colleagues in Europe and America recognized his qualities also as those of a good European, saturated by the genius of many peoples and times. In most respects he was the least dogmatic of men, shunning too systematic an edifice of thought, and avoiding the excesses of too rational an accounting of reality. He contributed as much as any single professor of the history of art to the intellectual life of an international community. He was as much at home in Scandinavia as in Italy, in England as in Roumania, in Germany as in Spain.

The institutes he founded in France, in Roumania, and in the United States, bore the impress of his many-sided nature. In his hands the history of art was never a narrow discipline. Students from many fields came to him, and his methods were so supple that his instruction was valuable to philologists and biologists, to artists and mathematicians. He was the spiritual descendant of the nomadic professors of the Middle Ages, the vehicle of a profound and intense culture, best transmitted by the living word in lecture-hall and seminar. Impatient of national boundaries, he mediated among conflicting loyalties, conveying from country to country

the meaning of the intellectual fraternity of scientific work. And in each country he sought constantly to define the forces of good will. When he represented his country in Germany at the Goethe festival, the Germans were afforded a fresh understanding of aspects of the history of German art. In Geneva he participated in the international educational efforts of the League of Nations. In America he achieved a sympathetic understanding of the United States, and in Latin America he drew thronged audiences not only for what he could tell of France, but for what he had perceived as essential to the problem of actuality in Brazil or in Argentina. To his students in this country he gave the sense of manifold currents in European civilization, for he was a spiritual citizen in many of its regions.

Focillon's published work is unusually abundant and variegated, distinguished by the union of experience and meditation. It is not always the case that great richness, power, and discrimination of mind are discovered in academic publication: masters of Focillon's stature usually display two personalities; the one to be seen and heard, and the other to be read. Focillon endowed his writing with the charm of his conversation, and in conversation he spoke with the order and discipline of considered writing. Always impatient of ostentatious sensibility and aestheticism, he was the ruthless critic of his writings, speaking of them with a candor and detachment that impressed upon his students the provisional nature of the stages of erudition. The beginners and amateurs who came near him he drove towards the frontiers of knowledge; no one under his influence was in a condition to tarry among the elements of a stale erudition. The example of his prodigious industry and the formal perfection of his public appearances, both written and spoken, made emulation impossible, but gave his students the incentive to finished craftsmanship. Every course of lectures was a sturdy bridge into knowledge, exquisitely constructed, and never repeated. His mind was stored with extraordinarily accurate observations and an immense fund of knowledge in many fields of learning; the entire complex was constantly in process of reorganization. In successive years of the same formal instruction, his hearers encountered changes, developments, and hardy speculations which, with other minds, are usually the fruit of decades of cogitation. Whether in writing or in teaching, he conveyed the actual state of knowledge in a few powerful and richly-detailed paragraphs or chapters. Then, as from a horn of plenty, he showered the theme



with collateral and convergent information. Finally the possible interpretations and avenues of further study were blocked out with an eloquence and precision of statement perhaps unmatched in American academic life.

With colleagues and students, his austere purpose was clothed with affection and delicate concern. In regulating difficult administrative tensions, Focillon forever sought the mean between achievement of his aims and a tactful regard for human feelings. When students had proven their vocations, Focillon tacitly awarded them wide freedom, never jealously maneuvering their restriction to the territories of his own interest. Whatever their choices of field, Focillon's rich experience of scholarship and letters, of museography and public life was available to them. To the visitor making the proper approach, Focillon was extraordinarily accessible, fusing his private and public life into one. Whether in the Rue des Fossés St. Jacques, or at Maranville, or at his apartments in the Taft Hotel, he and Madame Focillon extended a warm hospitality to innumerable guests. Meetings with him were pleasantly surrounded by minor formalities, never constrained or humorless, but enhancing the dignity of the exchange of views. He disliked facile eloquence and ready answers, and encouraged his pupils in hesitance before speaking. With casual students Focillon was exceptionally patient and hopeful, seeking always to salvage and develop the nucleus of any ability. Within his immediate circle of pupils he exacted a difficult standard of performance. The presentation of their work was invariably greeted with some congratulation upon its excellence. Students quickly learned how richly shaded his approval could be. The initial words of approbation were followed by searching and humane criticism; and the student usually left the meeting in the feeling that his work was perhaps not a worthless beginning.

To invoke such confident humility was Focillon's purpose not only with his pupils, but with his own writings. His vocation as an historian of art is stated in an autobiographical fragment first published in 1936. It not only exposes his doctrine, but it defines a frame of mind within which the future of general historical studies will find ample accommodation: "Dans des recherches nécessairement diverses, poursuivies trente années, et qui me furent autant d'expériences intellectuelles, j'ai été guidé par quelques principes que m'avaient inspirés les artistes eux-mêmes dans la familiarité de leur pensée créatrice. Je n'ai pas commencé par un système. C'est après avoir longtemps travaillé que j'ai cru pouvoir rédiger quelques

conclusions. Les formes sont l'essentiel, elles combinent entre elles certains rapports, elles dessinent, à travers l'histoire, des parcours que n'explique pas la pure succession des temps, et, plus que la valeur précaire et mobile de leur contenu, elles révèlent la présence éternelle de l'homme. J'ai souhaité d'abord être le naturaliste de ces mondes imaginaires. Et puis il m'a paru plus utile, et peut-être plus beau, de dessiner, même en traits imparfaits, la logique toute particulière qui semble présider à leur création et s'imposer à leur analyse. J'ai tenté d'esquisser le rapport de cette logique et de la vie historique. Mais ce traité de l'enchaînement des effets et des causes reste un traité de la liberté. L'homme n'est pas un produit passif. Il travaille perpétuellement sur lui-même. Il cherche sans répit sa forme et son style."

GEORGE KUBLER  
*Yale University*

## THE WAR AND MEDIAEVAL ART<sup>1</sup>

BY CHARLES R. MOREY

ONE of the officers whose job it is to look after the imperilled cultural treasures in war areas,—officers who rejoice in the military title of "Advisers on Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives," but have been shortened to "Venus-fixers" by the common soldiery,—was asked to state, briefly, the effect of the war on the art of Europe. He answered, briefly, "the Baroque got it."

No mediaevalist will take satisfaction from the truth of this statement, which merely states a result that might have been expected, namely, that the larger monuments of the Renaissance and the Baroque periods made larger targets for bombs and shells. But the mediaevalist can nevertheless take comfort in the relatively small number of important mediaeval monuments that are so far reported as casualties of war. Moreover, much that is most precious in mediaeval art is in the form of small objects preserved in museums and libraries,—manuscripts, ivories, enamels and other metal work. Some of these museums and libraries have been bombed or shelled, as for example the municipal library of Tours which is reported as "partly demolished." But if we may judge from reports which specifically mention the contents of such repositories, the manuscripts and objects of the minor arts were put in safety when the threat of war arose, and are in safety still. One such case concerns the contents of the museum of Leghorn, and the city archives, which were taken out and stored in the Grifoni palace in San Miniato near Pisa. When the war moved up through Tuscany, half of this palace was destroyed, but the half preserved was that which contained the art-treasures and archives of Leghorn. Looting, too, has been rare in the case of public museums and galleries; in their retreat from South Italy the Germans seem to have carried away a number of small coin collections, but left the libraries and well-known museums alone. An exception was the library of the Royal Society at Naples, which they burned, together with the archives of the city of Naples, in reprisal for the shooting of a German soldier.

<sup>1</sup> From a paper read at the symposium, "Europe's Monuments as Affected by the War," held by the Archaeological Institute of America at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, December 28, 1944.

This being so, we shall probably not have to mourn the loss of much of the minor arts of the Middle Ages, at least so far as we can judge from the authentic reports at hand. The best stained glass in France, for instance, seems to have been taken down and stored at the beginning of the war. This was true at least of Chartres and Troyes. Outstanding works of minor art are now beginning to come out of their hiding places in France and Italy, like the famous golden altar frontal of Basle cathedral, a pre-war treasure of the Musée Cluny in Paris, which was recently photographed in the courtyard of the Louvre. It had a narrow escape as it was, being one of the objects envisaged in an "exchange" of works of art between the Vichy government and Germany,—an "exchange" which never came off owing to some ingenious delaying tactics employed by French directors of museums. Where metal work is a fixture in a church it is of course not so fortunate. The finest Romanesque bronze work in Italy is furnished by the reliefs of the doors of the cathedral of Benevento, which was gutted in the South Italian campaign. Even here, however, destruction was not total: out of 72 panels only 6 are missing, and only 30 are damaged to an extent that restoration is difficult or impossible.

Frescoes share the fate of the walls that carry them. The toll of Italian mediaeval frescoes ruined by bombing or shelling is by no means complete, but the majority of such casualties will be found in small country churches which succumbed entirely to the blasting of artillery or dive bombers while they served as forts or machine-gun nests. Such provincial works in the nature of things are rarely of first importance. But there are some that are grievous losses, as for example the ruined portions of the trecento frescoes in the Collegiata at San Gimignano where Barna da Siena's *Life of Christ* has lost two-thirds of the *Marriage at Cana*, and suffered bad mutilation in the *Christ before Caiaphas* and the *Crucifixion*. Four of Bartolo di Fredi's frescos in the same church are injured: *Moses before Pharaoh*, the *Crossing of the Red Sea*, *Moses on Sinai*, and *Joseph and his Brethren*. The recent collapse of a wall has increased the damage. Against this we may count the salvage of a series of great mediaeval panel paintings: Duccio's great altarpiece of Siena cathedral was stored in the bishop's palace at Mensarello and recovered intact by an American Monuments officer; the Madonnas of Duccio and Cimabue were kept with other early masterpieces in a depository 16 kilometers southeast of Florence, where they were protected from drunken German paratroopers, first by a

courageous curator of the Uffizi acting alone, and later on by a group of British soldiers who drove off the Germans.

The outstanding calamity in the category of fourteenth and fifteenth century painting is the burning of the Campo Santo at Pisa. This was a stupid accident, caused by a stray shell that hit the roof last July. The roof caught fire; there was no water supply, and blazing beams fell down against the frescoes on the walls, while molten lead from the roof rained down and cracked the marble monuments in the corridors. The Germans helped the destruction later on when they shelled Pisa, including the Campo Santo. The *Triumph of Death* has lost its famous group of cripples; the lower frescoes of this south wall, which had been transferred to canvas, were altogether destroyed. The east and west walls are undamaged or at least are not beyond the possibility of restoration, but the north wall, with the frescoes of Benozzo Gozzoli, is in very bad shape, not only from the breaking-off of the plaster, but from the crumbling of the surface of the fresco due to the disintegration of the plaster of Paris that was mixed with the colors. The one redeeming feature of all this damage is the superior quality of the underdrawing revealed where the plaster has fallen away. Repair was quickly started: the damage was inspected by the monument-officers on September 11th, restorers were commandeered from Rome and Florence on the 12th, and work began on the 13th.

No major loss has yet been recorded among the wall mosaics of Italy and Sicily. Palermo's fine Byzantinesque churches, and their magnificent tapestry of mosaic, are all intact. Rome is untouched, save for the damage done to S. Lorenzo, and this merely removed some of the late and unregretted decoration of the church with no harm to the famous arch mosaic of the late sixth century. An almost incredible last minute report on Ravenna has just been received from Lt. Col. De Wald, head of the monument-officers in Italy, who has written me that by a veritable series of miracles all of the famous mosaics of the early Christian period that makes Ravenna so precious in the eyes of mediaevalists are intact. On the mediaeval monuments of other north Italian towns, beyond the Allied lines, we know nothing definite. Enemy reports, and air surveys, make it fairly certain that the Arena chapel at Padua and Giotto's frescoes are unharmed, and we have reason to think that the churches of Milan have nearly all escaped essential damage, including the cathedral.

Pisa south of the Arno is a shambles, in the midst of which stands,



untouched, that little gem of Gothic architecture, S. Maria della Spina. Its neighbor, S. Paolo a Ripa d'Arno, was not so lucky, and only its façade still stands. The cathedral group north of the river, "destroyed by the American artillery" according to German broadcasts, is intact. Much of the damage to Italian churches is due to German mining; Siena was thoroughly mined, but the Germans left the mine-plan behind them and the mines were removed accordingly. The town walls of Urbino were mined, but only the south-west corner exploded. In this part of Italy the Germans made a practice of mining the campaniles of the churches, with the idea that they would make convenient road blocks when they blew up. But in nearly every case, as happened with five churches at Fano, the towers fell instead into the church itself, destroying the roof and often the apse and altar.

The sites that come immediately to mind when the mediaevalist thinks anxiously of Central Italy,—Orvieto, Siena, Arezzo, Perugia, Florence,—have all escaped damage to their mediaeval monuments. All the bridges over the Arno at Florence are gone, but the one mediaeval bridge, the Ponte Vecchio, still stands though with much mutilation of its picturesque embroidery of shops and houses. Viterbo suffered badly; the churches of S. Francesco and S. Giovanni in Zoccoli were destroyed. Volterra's cathedral was hit, with damage to the frescoes in the Cappella S. Paolo, but nothing else in the building was hurt until the last shell fired by the retreating Germans ruined the valuable collection of mediaeval vestments in the cathedral's museum. On the whole, the fortune of mediaeval art in Italy, unless future reports belie our optimism, seems to have been superior to that of the mediaeval monuments in the war zones of France.

In the four departments of the Rouen region, our committee listed 159 monuments. Reports are at hand on 90 of these, and of this group 32 are reported intact, 44 severely damaged or destroyed; the rest are supposedly uncertain of classification. Caen lost St. Pierre (said to be restorable) and St. Jean, notable flamboyant churches, and the Romanesque and late Gothic church at St. Gilles. But the two great Norman abbeys, St. Etienne and the Trinité, are still standing, the former unhurt, the latter only slightly damaged. Bayeux came through without harm, and Jumièges and St. Georges de Boscherville, so that the beginnings of Gothic in Normandy are still to be seen in their most interesting and imposing examples. Lesser monuments were not so fortunate; the Gothic gateway (Tour

d'Horloge) at Vire is ruined; the flamboyant church of Carentan is badly damaged; the cathedral of St. Lô is in pieces. Coutances cathedral is less seriously hurt, and the much advertised destruction at Rouen cathedral seems to be limited to the collapse of the south aisle. At Rouen, also, St. Ouen and St. Maclou are both damaged, but not beyond restoration. In Normandy as in Italy, the worst destruction is found in the villages and towns small enough to be completely enveloped by the tide of war. One such victim was St. Sauveur-le-Vicomte southwest of Cherbourg, an old abbey which the Germans had converted into a fort; another was the lovely little church of Norrey near Caen, of which a former student of mine, now an officer of Canadian artillery, wrote as follows:

"In the village hangs a sign: 'Visitez l'église de Torrey; merveille du XIII siècle.' But the 'merveille' happened to be in the middle of a bitterly contested area and was badly wrecked. As if this were not enough it finally became necessary for the local curé to post a sign requesting that the broken stones be not carried away 'as they are of great age.' They were being used to surface roads!"

Elsewhere in France, we have to record the considerable damage to St. Gatien, the cathedral of Tours, as well as to the thirteenth-century church of St. Julien in the same city. The campaign eastward from Paris left little important losses behind it. At Troyes and Chalons the damage was slight. Our artillery, directed against a German observation and sniper post, badly injured the early Gothic church of St. Yved at Braisne, but the most valuable Gothic work from this site is the sculptured tympanum of this church, safely located for some time in the museum of Soissons. Soissons itself is unharmed, save for further damage to the ruins of the old abbey of St. Jean-des-Vignes, already damaged in the first World War. Laon's cathedral and its bishop's palace are practically untouched.

Amid all the destruction that fell to the lot of Chartres, the great cathedral, in spite of its situation near the much-bombed airport, came through practically unscathed. The great Gothic monuments of France are nearly all intact: Amiens, Chartres, Notre Dame at Paris, Reims. The cathedrals of Britain, with exception of Exeter and Coventry, have suffered little so far as published or unpublished reports can show. Even the cathedral of Cologne, monument of German dependence on the taste of France, survived the continued bombing of the nearby railroad station with serious damage only to its north transept. The rest of the mediaeval monuments of Cologne will doubtless tell another story when their condition can be

verified, and mediaeval art will have lost many a precious example when we know the extent of destruction wrought by the bombing of German cities. Nevertheless in the homelands of mediaeval art, in Italy and France, we can be thankful for the survival of its monuments to a degree that no one had any reason to expect or hope.

***Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas***

## THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON RENAISSANCE AND BAROQUE ART IN ITALY<sup>1</sup>

BY RENSSELAER W. LEE

ON A blackboard in one of the rooms in the Pretura at Terracina, an American officer saw written in what appeared to him the angular hand of one accustomed to writing German script: "Chi entra dopo di noi non troverà nulla" (whoever enters after us will find nothing). The contents of the Museo Civico, housed in the Pretura, were in disorder and damage to the building had exposed to the weather a library of old books on the second floor. Although not one of the worst scarred towns itself, Terracina lies on the coast in that general section of country between Cassino and Rome that was perhaps more badly battered and looted than any other by the Germans in their retreat from Cassino to the Gothic line. Many towns along or near the ancient Appian Way, the "regina viarum"—Gaeta, Fondi, Cori, Velletri and others—suffered, amid the wide extent of general ruin, terrible damage to their historic palaces and churches. This is true as well of the ancient Via Latina, farther inland, the route taken by Hannibal (Livy XXVI, 8) north from Cassino to Tusculum. Here among other places, Palestrina near the northern end and farther south, Aquino, birthplace of St. Thomas Aquinas and Juvenal, suffered heavily. This wide damage in Latium, in which Renaissance and Baroque buildings took their share of punishment, has had its less severe parallel, as the armies moved north, in the region of the Abruzzi, where, however, Aquila and Sulmona, the most important cities, have emerged unscathed. Farther north in the three provinces that are all important for the history of Renaissance art, Umbria, the Marches, and Tuscany (especially, it would appear, in the last) there has been extensive damage, although the major artistic centers have, despite losses, generally fared pretty well.

One should never minimize the loss to the history of Renaissance and Baroque art in the Italian campaign. And yet if we survey the

<sup>1</sup> From a paper read at the symposium, "Europe's Monuments as Affected by the War," held by the Archaeological Institute of America at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, December 28, 1944.

extent of this loss south of the present battle line in the light of the German soldier's threat at Terracina, we must be thankful that, in spite of serious damage and looting, especially in smaller towns and villages that have felt the full shock of war, the allied troops who entered after the Germans have found that the most important monuments of Renaissance and even of Baroque art have by and large survived. Of the two the Baroque has been the heavier sufferer, notably in the campaign of 1943 and early in 1944 before the stand of the Germans at Cassino. Important churches were destroyed or seriously damaged at Palermo and at Naples and heavy damage was done later to some of the most notable villas at Frascati. But the palaces and churches of Rome, including the greatest works of Bernini and Borromini are of course unharmed, and Lecce, the most luxuriant example of a southern Baroque city, did not, so far as I know, receive a scratch. For the Renaissance in Italy, the record is impressive: Rome, Assisi, Perugia, Urbino, Ascoli-Piceno all but intact; the most important monuments preserved at Florence, Pistoia, Prato, Lucca, Arezzo, Siena and Cortona.

Early in September, 1943, an eye-witness of the destruction in Palermo, one of the most damaged Italian cities, remarked that very few buildings remained wholly untouched, the important Byzantine monuments constituting a spectacular exception. In December work was in progress on eight churches and two palaces and had been completed on six churches. The two most distinguished Baroque churches of the city suffered heavily. The dome of San Giuseppe dei Teatini was destroyed and the nave roof and side cupolas damaged, frescoes and stucco decoration sharing in the fate of the main fabric; the Casa Professa or Church of the Gesù with its rich marble and stucco decoration was seriously hurt. Behind its façade, which is practically intact, the interior of the Church of the Olivella is literally destroyed; the Oratories of S. Zita, and S. Lorenzo (particularly the latter), with their famous stucco decoration by Serpotta, suffered severely and in September, 1943, the stuccoes were in desperate need of protection from the weather to which they were exposed. Among the Renaissance churches, S. Maria di Piedigrotta near the port and the Annunziata were totally destroyed.

Like Palermo, Naples was severely damaged by air attacks and, once more, Baroque churches with their broad naves and large domes were heavy sufferers. Here, as elsewhere, first aid was given as soon as possible by our Monuments officers who were assiduous in supervising the reinforcing of walls, the shoring up of arches and



ceilings as well as the removal of rubble and its careful sifting for fragments of painting or sculpture that it might contain. About forty churches or 10% of the total in Naples were damaged; but in less than one month after the Allied occupation six projects of rehabilitation and restoration were under way and not many months later twenty-six projects had been started, with twelve more approved. Among Baroque churches S. Paolo Maggiore, the Gerolomini, the Annunziata, built over an earlier foundation in 1760 by Vanvitelli, and S. Pietro Martire all suffered severe damage when high explosives pierced roofs or domes; S. Chiara's roof collapsed and the rich Baroque interior, which covered a Gothic under structure, has been badly injured. For the history of Renaissance art the most interesting building in Naples is the church of Mont' Oliveto which suffered through concussions and explosions incident to the German aerial attack of March 15, 1944. The sculptured altarpiece by Benedetto da Maiano fell to the ground but all the fragments are reported to be in a good state of preservation so that restoration will be possible. Antonio Rossellino's famous relief of the *Nativity* in the same church is presumably safe; his grave monument of Maria of Aragon on an adjacent wall has been broken into fragments, but these have been carefully gathered together by Monuments officers and the fractures are so clean that reconstruction is assured. The tomb of Cardinal Brancaccio at S. Angelo a Nilo with Donatello's exquisite relief of the Assumption has not been reported damaged and although an Italian source reports the Castel Nuovo hit, no damage apparently was suffered by the quattrocento sculptures of the arch celebrating the triumph of Alfonso I in 1443. In the notorious burning of the University, Baroque painting suffered a loss when three pictures by Solimena perished along with 50,000 volumes. North of Naples a great Baroque masterpiece of the 18th century, Vanvitelli's Royal Palace at Caserta with its wonderful garden, in spite of some damage to the main building, has suffered no irreparable harm.

Although Rome itself escaped all damage to Renaissance and Baroque art, there were severe casualties in the environs. At Frascati, for instance, high explosives have half-demolished the Villa Falconieri, Borromini's finest secular building, the south wing being entirely gone and the central section having suffered badly. The Villas Ruffinella and Lancellotti (in the latter Cardinal Baronius wrote his famous church history) have been badly scarred and the Villa Aldobrandini, besides receiving holes in its roof, has had

the right half of its plaster facing stripped away. The little church of the Gesù is bereft of its roof and cupola, but fortunately Pozzo's illusionistic ceiling was painted on canvas and had been stored away before the destruction. Those who have sojourned in Tivoli will regret to hear not only of slight damage to the Temple of the Sibyl and Hadrian's villa, but also that a bomb struck one wing of the Villa d'Este, destroying several frescoed rooms while shells have damaged the gardens and done some harm to the great water organ.

North of Rome several towns suffered heavily. In the bombing of the port of Civitavecchia, Bernini's arsenal was almost entirely destroyed and the grandiose Forte Michelangelo in which Bramante, Antonio da San Gallo and Michelangelo all had a hand (Pope Julius II laid the corner stone) has lost its northeast tower and otherwise suffered severely. It has been said that Viterbo in proportion to its size and the importance of its monuments has suffered worse than any city of Italy, Naples and Palermo included; but the main damage was to the fine mediaeval churches which lie around the circuit of the walls to the north and east and to the museum in the former church of S. Maria della Verità in which Lorenzo da Viterbo's engaging 15th century murals, especially his *Marriage of the Virgin*, sharing the fate of many provincial frescoes, have been partly destroyed and the collections of sculpture and painting damaged. Of her many beautiful fountains Viterbo lost only one, the fine 16th century creation of Montelupo and Vignola in the Piazza della Rocca. In the environs the elegant Renaissance church of S. Maria della Quercia is reported unharmed and fortunately no permanent hurt has been suffered by the famous Villa Lante, and its gardens at Bagnaia, finished on Vignola's designs, although the Germans made a general mess of the place, and looted furnishings, books and small objects as they pleased.

As the tide of battle advanced northward the major centers of art with their sculpture and painting escaped for the most part serious injury. And in Umbria, in addition to the important sites, Spoleto, Spello, Montefalco and Bevagna are reported nearly intact. At Todi the great 16th century pilgrimage church of S. Maria della Consolazione lost no more than its window glass, while at Foligno although considerable damage was done to the Cathedral, the best paintings from the Pinacoteca, which had been stored in the crypt, were dug out of the rubble unscathed. But Foligno's most serious loss was in the complete destruction of the Renaissance church of

the Nunziatella with Perugino's fresco of the *Baptism of Christ*. In the Marches, Ancona and Fano were among a number of towns severely damaged and on the night of July 5-6 the Germans made a deliberate attack of eight waves of bombers on the sanctuary of Loreto. Fortunately most of the high explosive bombs achieved no more than near misses and although the dome and nave roof of the great Renaissance church were severely damaged, the Casa Santa was unharmed and there is no record of damage to Melozzo da Forlì's illusionistic frescoes or other works of art, all of which are presumably safe.

In Tuscany, although the fighting has been severe, the important Renaissance monuments have fared far better than one had reason to expect. The irreparable damage to the Benozzo Gozzoli frescoes in the Campo Santo at Pisa is a tragic exception. So is the destruction of the Renaissance church of the Osservanza outside Siena which may have included the loss of della Robbia sculptures. Siena itself escaped virtually unharmed and the damage to San Gimignano, shelled by the retreating Germans, is not nearly so severe as first reported by the press. The thirteen towers still stand; all the fountains are unharmed and the general aspect of the place remains unchanged. The shelling of S. Agostino left holes in the roof but failed to harm Benedetto da Maiano's great altar or Benozzo Gozzoli's frescoes of the life of St. Augustine—some consolation, perhaps, for the loss at Pisa. One may hope that in the severe damage to the Collegiata described by Professor Morey in the previous article, the beautiful Ghirlandaio frescoes of the life of Santa Fina have not been hurt. Southeast of Siena, at Pienza the Renaissance cathedral by Bernardo Rossellino which stands on one of the finest small squares in Italy has suffered considerably along with the nearby bishop's palace; and Vecchietta's fine *Assumption with Attendant Saints*, the altarpiece of the Cathedral, has been damaged by a flying shell fragment. West of Siena at Arezzo, an important rail center severely attacked by bombs, the fate of Piero della Francesca's frescoes of the *Legend of the True Cross* had caused the gravest concern. These are fortunately intact, but Renaissance art has suffered losses in the half demolished Casa Petrarca of the 16th century, and in the bombing of the fine cloister of the Badia. Also, according to a recent letter from Lt. Col. Ernest De Wald, Director of the Allied Subcommission for Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives in Italy, "the building in which the museum was housed was hit and

a number of primitives, which were not removed by the fascist ex-director [now in jail] were badly mangled; we have taken them to the laboratory of the Uffizi."

In the Arno valley, however, on the west side of the Gothic line, where the fighting has been bitter, Renaissance fresco painting has suffered a grievous loss in the probable destruction of Masolino's *Pietà* in the Baptistry of the Collegiata at Empoli, a fate no doubt shared by the beautiful quattrocento baptismal font. Empoli is reported to be in ruins, the Collegiata destroyed and the Baptistry buried beneath the shattered campanile. Of the more important artistic centers west of Florence both Lucca and Prato escaped lightly, in the former the greatest damage resulting from German pillage. Although the Cathedral roof was hit, there was no damage to Jacopo della Quercia's famous tomb of Ilaria del Carretto or other noteworthy sculptures of the quattrocento. In Prato only the little church of S. Bartolomeo, near the station, containing minor works of art, was demolished save for the facade. The out door tabernacle containing Filippino Lippi's beautiful *Madonna and Child Adored by Saints* was broken to bits with the wall which it adorned, but Lt. Col. De Wald writes that "a heroic restorer-expert [named Tintori] picked up the hundreds of fragments and has put them together in miraculous fashion so that the painting is now preserved for the future." The Cathedral is intact and the architectural portions of Michelozzo's pulpit on the outside were protected by a brick shelter while Donatello's reliefs of the dancing putti were walled up in the crypt. Pistoia suffered severely, especially the south side near the railroad station, where S. Giovanni Battista, an elegant little Renaissance church by Vitoni, was totally destroyed; but no damage has been reported to the noteworthy examples of mediaeval and Renaissance sculpture which the town contains.<sup>2</sup> Although S. Giovanni Fuorcivitas lost its whole roof, the famous *Visitation* by Luca della Robbia has been walled up and is believed undamaged. The interior of the Cathedral, though its roof was hit, is reported in good condition and so presumably are the silver altar of S. Jacopo and the Forteguerri monument with sculptures by Verrocchio. Nearer Florence, at Fiesole, the Duomo, S. Domenico and the Badia were all hit, but damage was slight and none has been reported to works of art within. South of the Arno, however, the village of

<sup>2</sup> An exception is the tomb of Filippo Lazzari by Antonio and Bernardo Rossellino in badly damaged S. Domenico, but, according to a recent press report the fragments have been saved and the monument can be reconstructed.



L'Impruneta shared the fate of many badly shelled small towns in Tuscany. The church of S. Maria dell'Impruneta is reported beyond repair, and the gravest fears must be entertained for Luca della Robbia's sculptures.

As to Florence itself—the Allied armies were admonished to consider the whole city a work of art—there is no need to repeat here what is already known of the systematic destruction wrought by the Germans to old palaces and houses at either end of the Ponte Vecchio and to the Arno bridges. The Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies on the Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas recently had a request from Lt. Col De Wald to send any measured drawings that could be found of the most beautiful of the bridges, Ammanati's Ponte Santa Trinità, since the Italians were eager to begin its restoration. We were fortunately able to find a set of such drawings in a volume published in London in 1822 which were photostated and despatched forthwith. But in contrast to the lamentable destruction along the Arno—senseless in the case of the approaches to the Ponte Vecchio since the bridge was too narrow for motor transport—is the striking and heartening fact that all of the chief monuments of Florence are relatively unscathed and even Santa Maria Novella, close to the bombed railway yards, received no hit, a tribute to the precision bombing of our air forces and to the care which they have taken to spare cultural monuments.

One had to be prepared for heavy damage at Rimini, until its recent capture the Adriatic end of the Gothic line, and consequently a highly important point of defense for the Germans. It was hoped that the city's most famous building and great shrine of Renaissance art, the Tempio Malatestiano might escape, but it was severely injured: direct hits nearly destroyed the apse end of the church and the sacristy; the tiles have slid from the nave roof exposing the interior to view from the air; Alberti's walls have been shaken and cracked. But the chapels containing Agostino da Duccio's Tomb of Isotta and his wonderful reliefs of the Arts and Sciences are still standing, and the sculptures partly protected by brick walls, have suffered almost no hurt. Piero della Francesca's fresco of Sigismondo Malatesta had been detached and removed from the chapel wall before the Allied troops entered Rimini. One may hope that precise information concerning its whereabouts will soon be forthcoming.

Of injury to cultural monuments in Northern Italy beyond the fighting line it is, of course, impossible at this time to give any



exact estimate, but air reconnaissance has in some cases substantiated enemy reports that the damage has been severe. We know, for instance, that a number of the handsome Renaissance and Baroque palaces of Genoa, including the Bianco, Rosso, and Doria-Pamphily have been heavily damaged and that the fine church of the SS. Annunziata has lost its left aisle. We know that in Milan, one of the worst bombed cities of Europe, Bramante's churches have had the good luck to escape serious injury, but that secular buildings have suffered very grievously: the famous Ospedale Maggiore and Alessi's grand Palazzo Marino are, according to Lt. Frederick Hartt, charred and blackened ruins; the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum is burnt almost to the ground; the Baroque Palazzo di Giustizia gutted. Among other buildings that have suffered severely from fire are the Brera Palace, Castello Sforzesco and Palazzo Litta, not to mention many charming and historic houses of the 16th and 17th centuries including the Casa degli Omenoni by Leone Leoni. Architectural monuments in Turin have not apparently received so much injury as those in Genoa and Milan and air reconnaissance has found no trace of the damage which the enemy asserts we inflicted upon the Palazzo Madama, the Palazzo Carignano or the Cathedral. But the entire north side of the handsome 18th century University has been burned out, the beautiful Castello del Valentino in the French Renaissance style has had its south pavillion badly damaged, the Palazzo Chiabrese has been gutted and the fine 18th century Teatro Regio completely destroyed.

This incomplete listing of damaged monuments will indicate that Italy north of the battle line has already suffered losses to architecture quite as drastic as those sustained by occupied Italy. But in the domain of fresco painting the loss of the Gozzolis at Pisa, the Empoli Masolino and the Perugia Perugino are all less than the destruction of Mantegna's frescoes in the Eremitani Church in Padua, the most serious loss to Renaissance art thus far in the entire war. Whether any portion of the great series has been saved is not known, but air reconnaissance last May discovered a small shed constructed inside the ruins of the Chapel about 15 or 20 feet high which may indicate that some attempt at salvage was in progress.

The fact that many works of art have escaped damage or suffered less than they might have is due in no small measure to the Italian authorities who deserve our lively praise and thanks for doing everything in their power to safeguard frescoes and sculptural monuments with blast-walls and sandbagging and who transferred mova-

ble works of art to places of comparative safety. Leonardo's *Last Supper* in Milan, protected with scaffolding and sandbags, is, according to enemy accounts and allied air reconnaissance, miraculously safe in the midst of ruin; the great pulpits at Pisa were similarly guarded; around Donatello's pulpits in San Lorenzo rectangular shapes of protective brick were constructed; in Rome where such precautions happily turned out to be unnecessary, Michelangelo's *Christ* in S. Maria sopra Minerva was swathed in glass wool; Bernini's *S. Teresa* wrapped in the same substance took on a curiously surrealist appearance, and against the outside wall of the church sandbags guarded against blasts in the street. In Venice Verrocchio's once proud *Colleoni*, deprived of his battle charger and removed to a vault, now, in company with Donatello's *Gattemelata* who shares his fate ("quantum mutatus ab illo") bestrides a saw horse. As to easel paintings and movable sculptures in museums and churches, they were placed in deposits, many of which have been secured by the allies with nearly all the paintings reported in good condition. Exceptions are Rosso Fiorentino's *Deposition* and Pontormo's *Visitation* presumably from the Pieve at Carmignano, west of Florence which were damaged when their hiding place at Poppiano was shelled by the Germans, and three of Uccello's frescoes from the Chiostro Verde of S. Maria Novella which suffered some injury in their refuge at the Villa della Torre at Cona.<sup>3</sup> The deposit of pictures from Siena, Grosseto and Massa Marittima in the Villa Gambea Castelli at Arceno had a narrow escape when Professor Carli of Siena, who had previously resisted the efforts of the departing Germans to carry away a large number, fortunately asked and received, in spite of battle conditions, a guard from the British C.O., eight of whom beat off fifteen Germans who attacked the villa on July 7 with the intention of robbing and burning it. Well known is the story of the B.B.C. correspondent in Italy who found himself in a villa south of Florence face to face with Botticelli's *Primavera*. The place was Sir Osbert Sitwell's castle of Montegufoni which contained a particularly rich deposit of Florentine masterpieces including the *Enthroned Madonnas* of

<sup>3</sup> A recent report, received since this article was written, contains the distressing information that the withdrawing Germans made off with 26 cases of ancient sculpture from the Uffizi stored in a deposit at Dicomano; 198 paintings from the Uffizi, Pitti, Accademia and S. Marco stored at Poppi; 58 crates, contents not specified, stored at the Villa Reale at Poggio a Caiano; and 69 cases of sculpture from the Museo Nazionale and other buildings in Florence, stored at Soci.

Cimabue and Giotto, Duccio's *Rucellai Madonna*, Masaccio's *Madonna and St. Anne*, and Andrea del Sarto's *Annunciation*, all in good condition. In charge was Professor Fasola of the Uffizi who had walked the long miles from Florence, and had protected the paintings from drunken German paratroopers, sometimes at great personal risk. Such was the importance of the deposit that General Alexander himself visited Montegufoni to make certain that adequate measures for safety had been taken to protect the pictures. Unfortunately, it was not the Italians but the Germans who supervised moving the valuable paintings of the Naples Museum from Monte Cassino to Rome. No one has yet explained the disappearance of some of the greatest masterpieces of the collection including the Raphael *Madonna*, Titian's *Danae* and *Portrait of Lavinia* and Breughel's tragic *Blind Leading the Blind*, painted out of the artist's memory of persecution and war.

In this attempt to summarize the extent of damage to Renaissance and Baroque art in Italy, it may be worthwhile, although only brief and incomplete records of damage have been available to me, to add a general postscript regarding France. In that country the greatest sites of Renaissance and Baroque art, Fontainebleau, Versailles, and Paris are almost unharmed. Fortunately for Paris, the Germans had to get out so fast that they had no time to strip the city of works of art, the Luxembourg Palace, headquarters of the *Luftwaffe*, being the only historic monument to suffer damage. The great public collections of France are nearly intact, the contents of the Louvre having been stored in seventy deposits, chiefly south of the Loire River. Private collections, on the other hand, if they did not have the good fortune to be made over to the Louvre before the fall of France and so to become part of the national collections, suffered seriously. Confiscated by the Germans or acquired by fictitious sale, they were placed in the gallery of the Jeu de Paume in the Tuileries, where the highly competent agents of Hitler, Himmler and Goering selected the finest works of art for shipment to Germany. If French collections have thus lost notable paintings and *objets d'art* which, one may hope, however, time will restore to their owners, recent reports tell of severe and sometimes irreparable damage to well known examples of Renaissance architecture. In Normandy, for instance, amid the devastation at Caen, the 16th century Hotel de Than and Hotel d'Escoville have been gutted; at Rouen part of the courtyard of the fine Hôtel de Bourgtheroulde has been demolished by a direct hit and on the

night of August 26, 1944, the magnificent late Gothic Palais de Justice was burned out when flames spread from the military telephone exchange across the street which the Germans had fired preparatory to evacuating the town. The outer walls still stand, but the interior is entirely gone. In the Loire Valley, Blois with its great chateau is fortunately intact, but the famous chateaux of Amboise, Chenonceaux, and Chinon have been partly demolished. At Tours the fate of Renaissance and later monuments during the course of the war has been harsh. The Hôtel Gouin with its beautiful early Renaissance façade, the fine Hôtel de Jehan Gallant containing the Musée des Antiquités de Touraine and the 18th century Bibliothèque Municipale (with the loss of most of its 179,000 volumes and 2061 manuscripts—fortunately the most important manuscripts were saved) have all suffered heavy damage. These are the most important losses that have come to the writer's attention and final estimates will certainly show that French Renaissance and Baroque art have suffered other serious losses as yet unrecorded. But thanks to the careful directing of Allied artillery fire, to precision bombing [based on maps made by our Committee in New York, which has recently received the praise of the French Ministry of Information, and to the conscientious care of Allied Monument Officers] these losses are far less than they might have been.

*Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies  
on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas*

## FURLOUGH IN ROME

BY HEINZ H. THANNHAUSER<sup>1</sup>

THAT morning we went to S. Luigi dei Francesi, to look at the Caravaggio pictures; but there was a big mass and celebration there by French troops of the 5th Army, so we didn't see them. The French came out later in a parade reminiscent of some I've seen in Paris, with turbaned troops and all (only their uniforms, except for headgear, are always American)—we took a picture or two of them. Next, we went to the Sapienza and got into the courtyard and looked at St. Ivo; unfortunately, the inside was closed, you can see it only on days when mass is held for the laureates. But we looked at the façade for quite a while, and after this visit to Rome I have even more respect for Borromini than I had by studying him formerly. From there we went to S. Agnese in Piazza Navona, and had a good look at the Four Rivers Fountain too, which really is a pretty daring *tour de force* on old Bernini's part. The veil of the Nile is quite something. All in all this visit to Rome has increased my respect for the technical courage and perfection of the Baroque masters if for nothing else in their work. Next, S. Andrea della Valle, which quite apart from its design was amazing as being the first example of Baroque cupola and ceiling decoration I'd seen—the Lanfranco dome not being, perhaps, as terrific as some of them, but quite an introduction! Then the Palazzo Farnese, which is now a French headquarters building. After asking some Sudanese guards for directions, we groped our way up and finally a maid showed us into the Galleria, which was just being cleaned up—what a thrill! A lot of super-moderns despise the Carracci as coldly academic and what-not, but when you see an ensemble like this, which so perfectly fulfills its purpose, your hat goes off to them. The freshness of the color is amazing, and both the figures and the entire composition are pure delight. Especially as a little breather after too many visits to the dark and serious churches—although I understand the fracas caused by cardinals having sexy things like that painted in their home! The other rooms were astounding too, with the woodwork ceilings, etc. I need hardly say how impressed I was

<sup>1</sup> Excerpts from a letter written to his parents during the summer of 1944 after a visit to Rome.



with the façade: in Rome, however, you get so, that the only thing you notice is a façade that is *not* perfect, the perfect ones being so common! Next, S. Maria in Vallicella, with another terrific ceiling, and the Rubens altarpiece with the angels holding up the picture of the Virgin that the gambler is said to have stoned when it was at S. Maria della Pace, whereupon real blood came from it.

\* \* \*

The next day we went to Santa Susanna and then to S. Maria della Vittoria, but unfortunately the Bernini *Ecstasy of St. Theresa* has been walled in for protection, like so many other things. The figures of the onlooking Cornaro family in the two side boxes are still visible, though. Then we went up to see S. Carlo alle Quattro Fontane, which is just about the most amazing of Borromini's *tours de force*. We couldn't get into the cloister but we looked for quite a long time at the amazing amount of movement and undulation he got into so small a façade at such a narrow corner. We tried to take pictures of it but will have to splice two together, there wasn't enough backing room.

\* \* \*

From there it was just a little way to Sta. Maria Maggiore, which I had especially wanted to see, after that unending paper I wrote for Koehler on the mosaics there. I was afraid they'd probably have them walled up like most of the apsidial mosaics in Rome, but lo and behold, they were all there in their full freshness! It was one of the most terrific artistic impressions I got on our stay in Rome. I had not expected anything like the strength of color that remains just gleaming out at you,—especially so, of course, in the case of the Torriti work but amazingly bright too with the old mosaics. We walked round the whole church looking at them all: the walls of Jericho falling down, God's hand throwing stones down on the enemy, Lot's wife turning to salt, the passage over the Red Sea, etc. I really was happy we had been able to get into Sta. Maria Maggiore.

\* \* \*

We had planned to go back via the Thermae of Trajan, but it got too late for that, and at S. Pietro in Vincoli, we heard that Michelangelo's *Moses* was all covered up, so we didn't bother. Instead, we dropped into San Clemente, where so many great painters have worshipped in Masaccio's chapel. Father McSweeney (it's a church

given to the Irish in Rome), who took us around, remarked, "He was quite a big noise in those days, as you would say!" First I asked him in Italian how to get to the subterranean church, and he answered in Italian and then said "Ye don't speak much English, do ye?" which was very funny. He proved to be an unusually interesting person, with the most intimate knowledge of art history and styles and so forth as well as all matters pertaining to his church and a lively interest in the war, discussing bombing formations and everything else. He is completely in love with Rome and said there was no place like it to live in, and that he hoped after the war we would all three come to stay and live there! The mosaics, as usual, were covered over, but we had plenty of time to study all the details of the Masaccio and Masolino works, and then went down to the old church below, with the Mithraic statue and the other amazing things. He showed us where the house of Clemens was, and pointed out the usual anecdotic details of the Cicerone with an ever so slight but delightful note of amusement in his voice, placing them where they belong: for instance, with the Aqua Mysteriosa, "because nobody knows where it comes from" he said, as if he meant to say, "and why should anybody give a damn, either?" All in all, on account of the Masolino chapel, the church itself, the subterranean part with its amazing fragments of early painting, and last but not least Father McSweeney's delightful and enlightened manner, this was one of our most memorable visits in Rome.

\* \* \*

We hailed a horse carriage and went straight to St. Peter's. As Paul and I had already studied it pretty thoroughly the time before, we just glanced in to give our friend a look at it, and then went straight to the Sistine Chapel. Well, there just aren't any words to tell how overwhelming it was. Here I'd written a paper, God knows how long, about the Prophets and Sibyls and the interrelation of figures on the ceiling, but I hadn't known a damned thing about the ceiling. It is so unbelievably powerful that you can't say anything. I kept looking, irresistibly, at the *Jonah*, which epitomizes to me the whole of Michelangelo's life and torture, and really is, in the last analysis, the culmination and cornerstone to the whole ceiling. What a piece of painting—what a piece of poetry, or philosophy, or emotional outburst, a whole age expressed in one movement of a body! The way in which everything including the Prophets and

Sibyls and Atlantes builds up from the relatively quiet figures in the chronologically later pieces (Biblically speaking) to the storm that sweeps through the early Genesis scenes and the figures around them, is inexpressible in words, Romain Rolland's or anyone's. As for sheer perfection of painting, the *Creation of Adam* just can't be beat. And say what you will, no photographs, detail enlargements of the most skillful kind, can ever do what the things themselves do to you, especially in the context from which you can't separate them. The *Last Judgment* is almost an anticlimax against it; and as for the Ghirlandaio's, etc., you just can't get yourself to look at them because something immediately pulls your eye up high again. And when has there ever been a man to do so much to your sense of form with such modest and restrained use of color? You begin to wonder why Rubens ever needed all that richness when a guy like this can sweep you off your feet with just a few tints of rose and light blue and yellow—but *where* the tints are put, oh boy! Well, it's all written up in all the books, but I just have to put down what it did to me.

#### *Mediterranean Theatre*

## ON THE DESIRABILITY OF A PRINT COLLECTION FOR A COLLEGE<sup>1</sup>

BY ULRICH MIDDELDORF

THE fact that no study of art can be considered serious which is not based on intimate acquaintance with original works of art puts us at a great disadvantage compared to our colleagues in literature. Any copy of the text of Shakespeare, however badly printed, is as close to the original as the particular edition can claim to be. Works of art can not be reproduced in such fashion; even the best facsimile of a masterpiece is separated from the original by an unbridgeable gulf. And yet we have to recur to reproductions if we do not want to exclude from our studies and teaching all the great works in distant countries, familiarity with which we can not presuppose in our audience and we, at times, not have ourselves. We can, however, counteract the factor of error thus introduced into our work by securing for ourselves and for our students the possibility of close contact with at least some original works of art, so that, by analogy, we may correct the vague and often false impressions gained from reproductions.

Much has been written about the problem of art collections to be established for this purpose in educational institutions. Some time ago<sup>2</sup> I pleaded for close cooperation between museums and colleges in order to save the latter the responsibility and expense involved in building up an art collection. While this is possible in towns where a museum and a college are located within a reasonable distance from one another, the question remains, what to do in the case of a college in a less fortunate situation, where some kind of a collection is badly needed. The art market has been sadly depleted of masterpieces of painting and sculpture of the past; and those which do occur are offered at prohibitive prices. Should a college then, be satisfied to buy works of second-rate quality? Certainly not; because instead of helping towards an understanding of the art of the past, they may mislead taste and judgment. Should

<sup>1</sup> Paper read at the Midwestern College Art Conference in Chicago, November 10-11, 1944.

<sup>2</sup> At the symposium, "The Future of the Art Museum as an Educational Institution," Chicago, March 24-25, 1944.

a college limit itself to contemporary work? Certainly not. As desirable as the inclusion of modern art is, exclusive concentration upon it would deprive the student of the possibility of surveying a wide range of art, a prerequisite for the formation of unbiased, liberal judgment.

Here we seem to have arrived at an *impasse*. As far as painting and sculpture are concerned there does not seem any way out, but for an occasional fortunate accident, such as the finding of a really good bargain, or the gift by a generous donor of a fine collection. Both instances, however, belong in the realm of sheer luck, and can scarcely be incorporated in a program for the development of an art collection. I propose quite a different way out of the dilemma—one which, it is true, does not lead to a complete solution of the difficulty, but one which is worthy of more consideration than it has heretofore received. A collection of original prints is well within the range of a college budget; and if on first consideration it may seem rather specialized, it can show in unadulterated fashion at least some of the true spirit of art. It has the additional advantage of interrelating with many branches of college education outside of art.

A print may be defined as a work of art of which really only the negative is the original, while the positive impressions are more or less mechanically done, and can be produced, at least theoretically, in unlimited number. As the "originals" are only the technical means towards achieving a final result we are justified if, conventionally, we call each impression an original. The definition is very wide since it includes impressions from plastic moulds, impressions of ornamental woodblocks on cloth and various other items. These techniques actually contributed to the invention of picture printing, and therefore are often represented in print collections, as are also products of the more recent mechanical reproductive processes. But even without such extensions, the field is wide enough to present every shade of artistic thought which has occurred to artists since the later 14th century. And thanks to its production in multiple copies, much of the material from the past is still preserved; hence prints do not pay such a premium for rarity as painting and sculpture. Consequently, it is possible to achieve in this field a degree of completeness unthinkable in any other, excepting perhaps pottery and similar branches of the technical arts.

A print collection can serve an endless variety of interests besides those of the specialist. We might remember that the collecting



of prints did not start as art collecting pure and simple. Though it is likely that most of the early amateurs were aware of the artistic quality of their treasures, they used to arrange their collections according to subject-matter, an indication that for them what was represented was at least as important as how it was represented.

What an early print collection looked like, we can gather from Florent le Comte's *Cabinet des Singularités* (Paris 1699), in the first volume of which is described "The Idea of a Beautiful Library of Prints." This ideal collection is divided into four parts: *Historical Subjects*, *Moral Subjects*, *Prints Illustrating the Development of the Arts*, and *Miscellanea*.

The first section is a compendium of illustrations of history from mythical times to the 17th century. Since prints can be of real value as historical sources, the historian would benefit from such a collection. The history of culture has to rely on prints almost as much as on literary sources. Many customs and habits, especially the humbler ones, have always been taken so much for granted by the literati, that they survive only rarely through the written word, while they are clearly described by the attentive and conscientious stylus of the artist. And few of the manifold motives which were considered suitable for prints, ever found their way into the monumental arts. One of the most important categories of prints in this section contains the portraits of famous people. The interest that we still take in them is documented by the voluminous portrait-indices, such as those published by the Library of Congress and by Singer.

Le Comte's second section, that illustrating the progress of the arts, in so far as it includes engravings after paintings, drawings, buildings, statues, etc., corresponds to our photograph collections and nowadays might be partially obsolete. Let us, however, not forget that even today a print after a painting occasionally is better than a photograph, and that many lost pictures are known to us only through prints. The same holds good for architecture. Again, destroyed buildings are only half lost, when they are preserved in prints. And, no doubt, the freehand rendering which underlies a print, gives a more adequate image of an interior, a whole building, a street, or a town square than the camera.

In due time we encounter in this section the material on which the modern print collections concentrate, namely the works of the *peintre-graveurs*, as contrasted to those of the reproductive engravers. Thus the development of print-making itself is presented;

yet always in connection with the development of the arts in general. The advantage of this must be clear to everyone, who with regret, has seen the study of art suffer by a specialization, which allows the print connoisseur to pursue his studies without a knowledge of the other arts and *vice versa*.

The section, Moral Subjects, includes religious, symbolical and emblematical material, i.e., all the things, which interest our modern iconologists and iconographers. Whoever has experienced the agonies involved in collecting material for such research, will appreciate the merits of such an arrangement.

The *Miscellanea* Le Comte suggests as a proper place for portraits of ladies, for pictures of animals, and for "a number of pieces of amusing and ornate subjects and styles." In this last category we would collect extensively: ornamental prints, engravings for furniture, silver, textiles, decorations, etc., in short, the immense wealth of decorative ideas engraved and etched by Nicoletto da Modena, Jamnitzer, Lepautre, Marot, Lalonde, etc. However, much neglected this material may be by the orthodox print-room, if we consider prints as only a small part of the arts we will have to do justice to it: it is closely linked with architecture and the decorative arts.

Le Comte's scheme acquaints us better, than a dry enumeration of the various types of prints could have done, with the variety of interests which might be developed in a print collection. We shall encounter the principles underlying Le Comte's plan time and again, as they still are much up to date. Why, for instance, does he speak about the collection as a print *library*? Obviously he meant to paste the prints in old-fashioned, well bound, folio volumes. For an amateur of his day that was not a bad way to keep his frail treasures, though it is unfeasible for a modern public collection. Yet, the fact still remains that a print collection is easy to keep and to handle and needs no special space as other collections. It can be treated as a supplement to a library. This, after the availability of the material and its manifold interests, is the third point which recommends a print collection to a college as a worthwhile and, above all, feasible educational venture.

What should be included in such a collection? First of all the "orthodox" material. Of course, it will be exceedingly difficult to secure specimens of the work of the earliest masters and some of the most famous prints by the best known artists like Schongauer, Dürer, Rembrandt, etc. Our budgets will force us to go easy on them. They, however, may be left to the collector snobs, for whom a

famous name or title have more value than the intrinsic qualities of a print. In place of the *Three Trees* our collection will have some of the smaller etchings by Rembrandt: they will play as adequate a role and will be less expensive. If Ostade or Ruysdael are beyond our reach, Bega or Everdingen might do. Few print-rooms can afford a Hercules Seghers, but Buytewech and Esaias van de Velde, although certainly not his equal, can console us for not being able to reach the stars. Large areas of the graphic arts in this field—fortunately for us—have been neglected by the traditional collector. Many prints of the 17th, 18th and earlier 19th centuries, which one seldom finds in the standard collections, are of great interest for our purposes.

To proceed along the lines thus described will not be easy—on the contrary it will prove a hard task for the beginner. It does not take much thought and does not involve much risk, to purchase for a great sum of money a famous print from a reliable dealer. It requires, however, knowledge and experience to hunt for the less known material. The curator who sets out with such an aim in mind will make mistakes, but gradually he will acquire a truly liberal education in his field. He will gain knowledge of prints unknown to collectors who never venture away from the well-trodden paths. He will sharpen his eyes, since there exist the same differences in quality between the various impressions of a print, whether by Bega or by Rembrandt. He will become acquainted with the print-market to an uncommon degree, since the best known dealers seldom carry the type of material in which he is interested.

How much attention a college collection should pay to the works of the reproductive engravers and to prints whose value lies primarily in their subject matter, will depend on local conditions. The possibility of building up special collections of such material should always be kept in mind.

One field, too little thought of, is that of the illustrated book. Every library owns some, but rarely are they used for the art classes. They need only to be catalogued properly in order to constitute a nucleus for a collection. When such books have little value as texts, they should be transferred to the print-room. The illustrated book is helpful, even necessary, to round out any print collection. Woodcuts of the 15th and 16th centuries, for instance, were mostly book illustrations to begin with and still can best be found in their original context. To ignore the illustrated book, means to miss the unique opportunity of owning works of art in their original set-

ting, still serving the purpose for which they were produced. Moreover, the illustrated book furnishes us one of the few concrete opportunities to talk about an interrelation of the different arts, since in them literature and the fine arts work hand and hand, on the same problems, towards a common aim. The ambivalence of the illustrated book will, however, usually manifest itself in the way a print with a historical subject seems to point in two different directions. A collection of such books could form a strong link between the art department of a college and other departments. Interdepartmental cooperation could help build the collection. A copy of Vesalius' *Anatomy* might be purchased jointly by an art department and a medical school; for the former it has value as a fine example of Venetian woodcuts of the school of Titian, for the latter as one of the foremost documents in the history of medicine.

Posters and specimens of commercial work can be made into a specialty, particularly in departments which offer courses in commercial art. As in the case of the illustrated book, the documentary value of such material for the historian, for the sociologist, etc., should not be underrated. Even such a collection, though primarily one of contemporary and comparatively recent material, might be extended with some effort pretty far into the past.

The inclusion of drawings and water-colors is debatable; strictly speaking they do not belong, though the fact that drawings, like prints, are usually on paper and of comparatively small size, has led to the convention of keeping them together. Also drawings go well with prints artistically, so that there could be no objection in principle to collecting them in a print-room. However, that introduces a complexity of problems as great as that of a collection of prints itself. To emulate in this point the print and drawing collections of our museums will be difficult and should never be attempted where the funds available are small.

If we want to prevent a print collection from becoming a mere repository of beautiful objects but want to make it an educational device, it should be supplemented by three items: a technical collection, a small research laboratory, and a reference library. This sounds more formidable than it actually is.

The technical collection should consist of displays illustrating the print techniques. It is not easy to get historical material for this. However, modern tools and materials are not essentially different from the old ones and can serve as substitutes. Engraved and etched plates, woodblocks, and proofs of the various stages in preparing a



print can easily be produced in any department which has an instructor interested in the graphic arts. Making it, would give valuable experience to the instructor as well as to the students, since it would induce them to experiment throughout the field of technical possibilities. The tools once acquired can serve a twofold purpose: they can be used; and when on display, together with the specimens of work, they will give the non-specialized student an insight into the technical processes. Such an exhibition might be supplemented with prints from old and modern treatises on the techniques of prints,<sup>3</sup> or with photographs showing the artist at work.

The reasons which compel us to think of a special library are obvious. Books on technique will illustrate the practical side of print making; those on the history of prints will help the curator in classifying the collection and the students in understanding its historical significance. It would be advisable to buy some of the many excellent facsimile reproductions, especially of the rare material. Used with discrimination and always supplemented by originals they can be most helpful. For class work a slide collection illustrating the different processes and the history of prints is useful. It permits a whole class to see enlarged details which usually are revealed through the magnifying glass to one individual only. Mr. W. Ivins' books on prints furnish excellent examples of the kind of details suitable for this purpose.

A collection formed in the described manner can be put to many uses. In our undergraduate teaching it might again draw due attention to the graphic arts, which have been unjustly eclipsed because of our one-sided preoccupation with painting, architecture, and sculpture. Better than any other kind of collection, excepting one of the technical arts, it can develop the student's taste for the real thing in art. He can handle prints and thus see them under the most favorable conditions. And while pictures on a wall have a habit of being overlooked, once the attraction of novelty has worn thin, a print, specially taken from a box for the benefit of the student, always commands a great deal of attention.

On a more advanced level the instructor can avail himself of prints for discussions, seminar work, term papers, etc. The wealth

<sup>3</sup> Particularly valuable for this purpose are the plates of the various editions of Abraham Bosse's treatise on etching and of Diderot and d'Alembert's or Pankoucke's encyclopedias. The woodblock cutter and printer were well depicted by Jost Amman.



of problems to be studied is immense. The topics should lead the student only rarely into the minutiae of print connoisseurship. In general they should be chosen so as to make the student aware of the interrelationship of prints with the other arts. In this field more than in any other we should by all means avoid the danger of wasteful overspecialization and take advantage of the many opportunities offered.

It is not impossible that students may make interesting contributions to the classification of the collection. Certainly they could, with profit, share in the exhibition program. The chance of educating print specialists should not be overlooked either. A student assistant could acquire experience in the history of prints as well as in the administration of a collection, which might help him to qualify eventually for a responsible position in a print cabinet.

Exhibitions of prints present fewer problems than those of paintings. Prints as a rule are matted in standard sizes, so that a small number of frames with glass can take care of changing exhibitions. The great European print-rooms used to hold their shows in the storage room or in the study room. Some of them had the doors of the storage cabinets fitted with glass frames for display. Further advantage is that large rooms are not only unnecessary, but even detrimental for a showing of prints.

Exhibitions can be changed frequently and arranged according to a great variety of points of view. Techniques may be singled out; subject matter can be followed through the ages. Artistic problems, such as, for instance, the treatment of light, or the handling of line may be made the focal point of an exhibition. Photographic enlargements can supplement the originals with great success, as was demonstrated by Mr. Schniewind in an exhibition: *The Discovery of Landscape*, which was on display a year ago in the Art Institute of Chicago. Photographic material from the other arts can be included to illustrate the place of prints among the arts. A curator with imagination, historical knowledge, and artistic sensitivity will find ever new ideas to show his material in an interesting and instructive way. In this respect the flexibility of a print collection cannot be matched in any other branch of the arts. Lively exhibition activity will help to mould the character of the collection so as to save it from acquiring the deadness of a postage stamp collection. A print collection which is frequently shown will have to be built up, so that every exhibition is meaningful. Thus it will gradually round itself out not according to convention or according

to the oeuvre catalogues of the masters, but in an organic way.

The transportation of prints is hardly a problem. Hence they are admirably suited for inexpensive circulating exhibitions, so that a well-stocked collection in a central location can service an entire region. That has already been attempted with success. The idea, however, can be vastly expanded: colleges could cooperate by specializing in different types of prints, and by exchanging material for exhibitions. In the same way they could cooperate with museums. Agreements of such kind would eventually make it possible for the smallest college to command for its exhibitions a truly comprehensive mass of material.

The most serious problem confronting a college which wants to have a print collection is that of administration. A curator is needed, either part-time or full-time, according to the size of the collection; secretarial help has to be supplied, to keep the collection and its catalogues in good order, to supervise the study and exhibition room, and to look after the mechanics of the exhibitions. The curator should belong to the teaching staff. Even if cooperation with a library is desirable, no librarian should ever be put in charge. The problems of a print collection are different from those of a library; and no system of library classification and cataloguing will do any good. The principles of administration and the technical details with which a curator should be familiar can be learned from a book like Singer's *Hand-Book for Print Collections*, or better, through apprenticeship in the print-room of one of our big museums.

The work in a print-room is not inconsiderable; the responsibilities are great. Love for prints alone is not sufficient qualification for a curator; experience and knowledge are required, and also a certain practical knack. The matting, mounting, and restoring of prints is best done on the premises by an experienced person. Often it is an integral part of the research connected with the cataloguing. The equipment necessary for a small technical laboratory is not expensive and may be quite simple.

In summing up, it might be said that a print collection fits into the scheme of a college better than any other art collection, though it may not be as showy as a picture gallery. The art students of course, will profit most by it, both in the practice and in the history of art. The value of such a collection for a general course in the humanities and for students in other departments could change the position of the art department as an odd, specialized spot on the campus to one in the center of things. The cataloguing and the

exhibition policy should take that into account. Even if we do not follow Le Comte's suggestion in arranging our collection we could index it in a similar manner and thus make it convenient for other departments to use. Exhibitions could be planned in cooperation with the historian, the scientist, the sociologist, in short as a service to any other discipline for which prints are of value. There is even no reason why local history might not find here its appropriate place. Prints illustrating American history and culture, even political cartoons, when collected with discrimination, can play a most useful rôle, and are still easy to find.

If we approach the problem in this spirit, we continue a good old tradition, of which Le Comte served us as a representative. In former times the knowledge of prints was an indispensable part of a liberal education and nearly every cultured home had its small collection. Even if today snobbery has degraded this branch of collecting, together with all the others, into an expensive hobby, a print collection in a college does not need to be considered a luxury for the exclusive use of a few select students and instructors, but as a potential meeting ground for the most diverse interests. A student, who was first attracted by the subject matter of prints, might begin to develop an artistic sensitivity as he becomes familiar with them. On the other hand, it would be a blessing for those of our students, who consider art a spider-web of lines and colors with some mysterious appeal to it, to be exposed to a robust and more naïve kind of appreciation of art. Moreover, these modest and yet significant works of art could help to destroy the prejudice that art exists for the well-to-do only. If the presence of a well conducted print collection on a campus will encourage students to start small collections of their own, we shall not only have fulfilled our duty in giving them an education in the understanding of art, but we shall have furnished them also with the stimulus to apply this education to some ideal purpose.

*University of Chicago*

## OBITUARIES

### THOMAS B. JEFFERY

Thomas B. Jeffery, who died on November 26, 1943, was born in Kenosha, Wisconsin, on May 27, 1905. His undergraduate work at Princeton, which won his election to Phi Beta Kappa, was especially concerned with English and art. Both subjects he continued at Oxford where in 1929 he received a diploma of art. In 1932 he was given the Master of Fine Arts degree at Princeton, was called that autumn to Wellesley College as instructor in the art department, and there in 1935 became assistant professor.

To many Wellesley undergraduates he is best known for his stimulating and illuminating instruction in the large introductory courses in Renaissance and modern art. To majors in art he is best remembered for his skilful handling of advanced courses in mediaeval, Renaissance and modern architecture. His special subjects of research were architectural. It was his wish to throw new light upon the style and the significance of French flamboyant, and to show that the Florentine baptistery dates from the 5th century. These studies were suspended because of the impossibility of concluding them until he should again be able to see the monuments. In all his work he proved himself an art historian of rare perception.

His friends will acutely miss his complex and distinguished personality. That he had high standards appeared in many ways: in a keen sense of beauty, expressed not only in his lectures but in his environment of house and garden; in an intellectual curiosity, manifest in penetrating observations and in a love of philosophical discussion; in the well-bred courage and reserve with which he bore a series of personal disasters; in his exquisite manners and unflinching gentlemanliness. All who knew him well will not forget his dry and subtle wit, his personal charm and sweetness.

The loss of his unique combination of qualities is the greater because of its untimeliness.

BERNARD C. HEYL  
Wellesley College

## ERLING C. OLSEN

Erling C. Olsen was killed in action in Northern France on July 28, 1944, just before he had completed his 31st year. His death deprives American scholarship of an outstanding champion of the younger generation in the field of the history of ancient art. And the loss will be deplored by many of his friends among scholars in this country and abroad who regarded him as one of the greatest hopes of progress in knowledge in his chosen field.

Born in Chicago, Mr. Olsen was graduated from Harvard in 1935. He attended Princeton University from 1935 to 1937 (while doing additional graduate work at New York University) and received the degree of Master of Arts in 1937. In the summer of 1936, he held a Carnegie fellowship to the Institut d'art et d'archéologie in Paris. In 1937, he was awarded the Rome Fellowship of the American Academy in Rome. From 1937 to 1939 he travelled widely in Italy, Greece, North Africa and various European countries and acquired unusually early an extensive knowledge of monuments. In 1939 he was awarded the diploma by the American Academy in Rome.

His first article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (1938) dealt with the frieze of the temple of Hephaistos in Athens. But he early developed his major interest in the history of Roman sculpture. A paper published in the *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* (1938) deals with Republican portraiture. While in Rome, he began to prepare an extensive publication of the Arch of Septimius Severus and in the very preliminary stages established himself as an authority on that dark and crucial period of late antique art. In 1940 he joined me in writing a monograph on "Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore" (published in 1942), to which he contributed a brilliant stylistic analysis of his own which will remain basic for further discussion of Roman relief sculpture from Hadrian through the Antonines.

Deeply conscious of the dangers of Fascism and Nazism and profoundly devoted to his country, in the fall of 1939 he joined the National Guard to be prepared for what he knew was inevitable, and was mobilized in 1941. He served in the Infantry Intelligence Service first in this country and after early 1944, overseas.

Mr. Olsen was a gentle, sensitive and refined young scholar with unusually broad cultural interests. He was full of zest and sparkling with humor. To him, scholarly work was not a pleasant pastime in



an ivory tower or one of various ways of making a career and a living. His early volunteering for military duty was connected with his awareness of imminent danger to the entire structure of modern civilization of which his enthusiastically elected work was only a particle. It is typical of his vital approach that in spare hours in the army he studied Roman battle sarcophagi and discovered on these monuments a vitalization of that classical theme owing to the terrifying experiences of the reality of war (1943).

Most of his work, so full of promise, remains unfinished. His memory will remain alive with us.

KARL LEHMANN

*New York University*

### HEINZ H. THANNHAUSER

On August 15, 1944, Sgt. Heinz H. Thannhauser was killed in action while in service of his country as radio operator and gunner on a Marauder Bomber in the Mediterranean theatre. His parents have recently been notified that Heinz was awarded posthumously the Purple Heart.

He was born in Bavaria on September 28, 1918. The son of the well known Berlin and Paris art dealer, Justin K. Thannhauser, Heinz had a unique opportunity of becoming acquainted with the works of modern artists at an early age. He received his primary and secondary education at the Collège Français in Berlin and later in Paris at the Sorbonne. He then attended Cambridge University, England, and took his B.A. degree in 1938. In that year he came to this country at the age of twenty, and was holder of the Sachs fellowship at Harvard University. During his two years at Harvard, he specialized in the history of modern art and obtained the A.M. degree in 1941. At the Fogg his brilliant and active mind and his warm enthusiasms won Heinz the respect and the friendship of his fellow students and teachers. In the fall of 1941, he accepted an instructorship under Professor Robin Feild at Newcomb College of Tulane University. He was a collaborator of the *ART JOURNAL* where he published in March 1943 an article describing a project for collaboration between art and drama departments. He had planned during the summer of 1943 to begin work on his doctoral dissertation, but in February he entered the Army.

Heinz had shown much promise as a young teacher and scholar in the field of art history and his loss will be keenly felt.

H.R.H.

## NEWS REPORTS

### MIDWESTERN CONFERENCE<sup>1</sup>

The 1944 meeting of the Midwestern College Art Conference was held at the University of Chicago on November 10 and 11, under the presidency of James Grote Van Derpool of the University of Illinois, with Ulrich Middeldorf acting as host. During the afternoon three papers were read: "Speed-up Perceptual Techniques" by Hoyt R. Sherman of Ohio State University, "Can Art Be Measured" by William H. Varnum of the University of Wisconsin, and "The Implications of Television for Art Teachers" by Harry Wood of Bradley Polytechnic Institute. After dinner at the Quadrangle Club two more papers were heard: "A Chart of Contemporary Painting" by Lester R. Longman of the University of Iowa, and "Social Trends in American Painting" by Henry R. Hope of Indiana University.

During the conference a special exhibition of water colors by Lionel Feininger was arranged in the gallery of Goodspeed Hall by the Renaissance Society.

At the Saturday morning session Ulrich Middeldorf read a paper entitled "Problems and Procedures in Building a Print Collection for a Small Institution" (to be published in the JOURNAL). During the business meeting, committees were appointed to study qualifications for membership and to examine the future role of the Conference, and to investigate teaching loads at various institutions.

The officers for the next year are: President, Haydn Huntley; Vice President, Henry R. Hope; Secretary-Treasurer, J. Carson Webster. In 1945 the meeting will be held at Northwestern and in 1946 at Indiana.

The thirty member institutions represented adopted the following statement of policy for art in general education in the colleges and schools of the 1944 Conference:

1. That where the colleges undertake to offer unified general programs in the humanities they should provide for art in them and for the participation of departments of art.
2. That the departments of art shall be consulted in establishing the content for art in such general programs, and in determining how it shall be taught.
3. That the criteria for art in such programs should be (1) that they provide for an understanding of art through formal analysis and/or historical interpretation, and (2) that they provide for appreciation of art through direct experience of it.

<sup>1</sup> A digest of the report prepared by Berthe C. Koch, University of Omaha, Secretary-Treasurer of the Midwestern College Art Conference, 1944.

4. That the methods of analysis, etc., shall be based on the best illustrative materials, including originals and facsimiles, and should employ dialectic procedures, and, as means to direct experience of art, there should be demonstration of and/or actual participation in basic processes of art.

5. That the content for understanding and appreciation should include the study of contemporary forms and problems, and the place of art in contemporary life.

6. That it is our desire to establish integration between art and other disciplines in the colleges.

#### CAA BUSINESS MEETING

The annual business meeting of the College Art Association will be held at the Institute of Fine Arts, 17 East 80th Street, New York, on Saturday morning, February 17, 1945, at 10 o'clock. In addition to reports of officers and committees, transactions of new business and elections, there will be a report at 2:30 P.M. by Mrs. Elizabeth Sunderland of Duke University on a project for low-cost 2" x 2" lantern slides. Proxies have been mailed for the use of members unable to attend the meeting.

#### METROPOLITAN LOAN AT WOOSTER

The inaugural event in the Josephine Long Wishart Museum of Art at the College of Wooster was an exhibition from October 20 to December 15, 1944, of paintings by French, Italian, Dutch, Flemish and German masters, lent by the Metropolitan Museum of Art. "You can easily imagine," writes Professor Theodore Brenson, head of the Department of Art, "what a deep impression the paintings have made among the students of whom many had never seen a good original painting before."

#### FORBES AND SACHS RETIRE

Edward W. Forbes and Paul J. Sachs, under whose joint directorship the Fogg Museum of Art at Harvard University has risen to the position of one of the great art institutions of the country, retired on December 1. Edward Forbes was appointed Director of the Fogg Museum in 1909. Now seventy-one years of age, he becomes Director *Emeritus*. Professor Sachs became Assistant Director in 1915 and Associate Director in 1924. He had already won an enviable reputation as a collector and was known here and abroad as a gifted connoisseur. He remains as Professor of Fine Arts, but relinquishes his post as Associate Director. A successor has not yet been named.

#### REGISTER OF AMERICAN ART RESEARCH

The American Art Research Council, in collaboration with the College Art Association, is asking college art departments to register with the Council the subjects of all graduate theses in American art now in progress,

and of undergraduate theses if of sufficient importance. This will enable the Council to act as a clearing house of information for colleges, thus helping to avoid duplication in the American field. At the present time the information being gathered does not cover the field of architecture but is concentrated upon painting, sculpture and the graphic arts. Printed cards for recording this information may be had from the Council office at 10 West 8th Street, New York.

#### CARNEGIE GRANTS-IN-AID

Through the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation the College Art Association will again offer for the year 1945-46 a number of grants-in-aid to outstanding graduate students of the History of Art for the purpose of assisting them to complete their graduate work. These grants, open to men and women, will be given only to advanced students of at least one year's graduate standing who have shown particular promise, and preference will generally be given to students about to embark on a doctoral dissertation or some comparable piece of research. Each candidate will submit with his application an extended statement of the plan and purpose of his graduate study for the coming year and may be asked to meet with the Committee on Scholarships of the College Art Association for a personal interview. The recipient of each grant-in-aid will be expected at a specified time to send the Committee a statement of work accomplished.

One grant-in-aid of \$1000 will be awarded to the applicant whom the Committee judges to have the highest qualifications, provided such applicant is of sufficient distinction. A few smaller grants will likewise be awarded.

Application blanks may be obtained through college art departments and from Prof. Rensselaer W. Lee, College Art Association, 625 Madison Avenue, New York. Applications must be sent in to this address by March 1st.

#### FINE ARTS FELLOWSHIPS

The Institute of Fine Arts of New York University announces a series of fellowships ranging from tuition scholarships to stipends of \$400 to \$1,500. Applicants wishing to begin work in the fall term should apply before March 1, 1945. For further information communicate with Professor Walter W. S. Cook, Chairman, Institute of Fine Arts, 17 East 80th Street, New York.

#### GRADUATE SCHOOL NEWSPAPER

The *Institute of Fine Arts News*, of New York University, edited by Kenneth E. Foster, published its second number in the fall of 1944. Made up of news and photographs of the students and of special activities at the Institute, it has a lively personal interest not only to alumni but to colleagues in other colleges.

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

WILLIAM COLGATE, *Canadian Art, its Origin and Development*, xviii + 278 p., 93 ill. Toronto, 1943, The Ryerson Press; Boston, Bruce Humphries, Inc., \$7.50.

A more suitable title for this book might have been borrowed from William T. Whitley's chronicle of English artists: "Artists and their Friends in Canada." For *Canadian Art* falls short of its promise to explore the origins and chart the development of art in Canada. Its author has culled a number of literary sources (listed in a bibliography) in order to compile a book rich in material about artists and the conditions under which they lived. Mr. Colgate has not approached his subject from an art historical standpoint, inasmuch as stylistic analysis has no place in his book; his is a biographical and "institutional" history of the art profession in various parts of Canada. This point of view accounts for the occasional lack of distinction between the leading painters themselves and persons important in the organization of art societies and academies. Several amateurs he has generously dubbed "masters." On the whole, *Canadian Art* suffers from having been written without a total view of its field. It loses sight of Canadian art while dealing in a detailed manner with Toronto art or Montreal art.

Thus in the arrangement of the subject-matter the title of the book is further abnegated. The chapters on painting have been arranged geographically by provinces, of which Ontario occupies the place of honor at the beginning of the book and receives seven of the twelve chapters. Such a practice, indefensible though it be, is explained by the fact that Mr. Colgate has for many years been the friend of artists and art circles in Toronto. After dwelling at length on the early painters from 1820 onwards, he pays much more attention to the founding of the Ontario Society of Artists (1872) and the Toronto Art Students' League (1887) than to the actual type of painting produced. The goal towards which Toronto painters worked was the establishment of a Canadian national style, achieved finally in the work of the Group of Seven (1919-1933). Important as the Group's style was in actual fact, its validity as a distinctive Canadian one may not be estimated from any analysis in Mr. Colgate's text, but only by chance in his quotations from journalist-critics or from anecdotes which found their way into his biographical material. The impression left is that the early style of the Group of Seven around 1920 (a moderate stylization of the northern landscape ranging from Lawren Harris's early near-realism to the flat patterns of Tom Thomson) was the climax of Canadian art for all time. Little is said about painting stylistically later; there is but



scanty mention of younger Canadian artists who have been broadening the scope of Canadian painting and enriching it in many ways.

The author's "regionalism" is obvious in his chapters on painting in the other provinces. From the pages on Quebec the newcomer to Canadian art would never guess at the existence of the many religious pictures and portraits painted in New France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Admittedly there is no printed material in English on the earliest Canadian painting, but the subject has been treated cursorily in French.<sup>1</sup> For Mr. Colgate the history of painting in French Canada began with François Beaucourt of Montreal at the end of the eighteenth century: he is called the earliest recorded painter! The classification of such twentieth-century artists as James Wilson Morrice and A. Y. Jackson as Quebec painters is refuted by their own wide travels and by the influence which they have exerted on artists of all parts of the Dominion. Nor has there been any appreciable difference in style between the painting of Ontario and Quebec since about 1850. Finally, the radical cubists and surrealists of Montreal and Quebec, Paul-Emile Borduas, Pellan, and others, have been excluded altogether from *Canadian Art*.

In his chapters on the Maritime Provinces Mr. Colgate has gathered a wealth of material on the early artists which had not previously been published comprehensively. In this purely archaeological labour, perhaps, there is a valid excuse for arrangement by locality, but certainly none when dealing with modern Canadian painting of East or West. For Canadian art today is not many schools but one. Yet the reader looks in vain for a definition of the Canadian tradition and for the characteristics of the Canadian vision. The most obvious traits of Canadian painting—its respect for subject-matter, its straightforwardness, its dislike of fancy—are all left for the reader to decide for himself by looking at one colour-plate (J. H. Varley's *Stormy Weather, Georgian Bay*, 1921) and a number of indifferently selected half-tones.

Sculpture and architecture are treated very sketchily at the end of Mr. Colgate's book. Here again is nothing whatever to suggest the distinctive types of Canadian house and church built during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, nor any hint of the art of wood-carving which flourished as New France's best art. The handicrafts receive some recognition, the author fortunately hitting upon two or three good modern practitioners such as Douglas Duncan in bookbinding and the Deichmanns of New Brunswick in ceramics. Needless to say, there is no word of the early Canadian handicrafts known through the wide researches of Dr. Marius Barbeau.

In spite of the unfortunate arrangement of the material in *Canadian Art* and the absence of an art historical technique in writing, the book must remain for the time being a valuable one. For it is one of the very few which have attempted to survey Canadian art. In its defense let it be

<sup>1</sup> Gérard Morisset, *Coup d'oeil sur les arts en Nouvelle-France* (Quebec, 1941).

said that source material and photographs of art objects from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been in large measure unavailable to the general writer. Competent monographs are only now appearing. It is perhaps inevitable that general histories should be unsatisfactory until the field has been more thoroughly explored in detail. In its approach Mr. Colgate's book resembles most closely Newton MacTavish's *The Fine Arts in Canada* (Toronto, 1925), another anecdotal book on artists and their friends.

The only other inclusive work is Graham McInnes's *A Short History of Canadian Art* (Toronto, 1939) which, in spite of inequalities of emphasis and its cursory nature, remains the most satisfactory as a textbook. A truly "art historical" history of Canadian art dealing with the stylistic phenomena of early times and their recurrence in later art, and with the development of the Canadian tradition, has yet to be written. When it appears, it will reveal a wealth of interesting material not dreamt of in the books mentioned above. For the present, though the researcher into Canadian art will consult Mr. Colgate's book, those interested in the Canadian or in the North American tradition will find little of interest here. Canadian literature on art remains largely in the category of local history.<sup>2</sup>

R. H. HUBBARD

National Gallery of Canada

TALBOT HAMLIN, *Greek Revival Architecture in America*, xl + 439 p., 94 pl. + 39 ill. in text. New York, Oxford University Press, 1944. \$7.50

The scope of this very engaging and readable book is more consonant with its sub-title, "Being an account of important trends of American architecture and life prior to the War between the States," than with its title, which implies the more restricted field of the Greek Revival. It begins with the early Federal years and provides a panoramic view of American architecture in its milieu, clearly and enthusiastically discussed and evaluated. Its various sections are devoted to the following topics: the remnants of the Georgian style in the Adam-like Post-Colonial; the birth of American or Federal (Neo-Classical) architecture under the care of Jefferson, L'Enfant and Latrobe; its maturity during the 30's and 40's as a "national" but rather Neo-Hellenic style under Mills, Strickland, Davis and others; its cosmopolitan diffusion in Philadelphia, Boston and New York; and its provincial manifestations in New England, the Old South and the regions of the Near and Far West.

While the book deals largely with those aspects of architecture which would come under the term "classical tradition" in its widest sense, it

<sup>2</sup> Since this review was written, the first exhibition to survey Canadian painting from the seventeenth century to the present day has been organised by the Art Gallery of Toronto, the Art Association of Montreal, the Musée de la Province de Québec and the National Gallery of Canada. The catalogue, *The Development of Painting in Canada, 1665-1945* (Toronto, 1945, The Ryerson Press) includes a brief but accurate account of the development and good bibliographies.

touches briefly and enlighteningly upon all the contemporary minor currents, whether these stemmed from the Egyptian, the Gothic or the indeterminate vernacular. Despite its comprehensiveness the book is not a superficial survey. When the subject demands it the panoramic view gives way to a sharp focus to reveal more clearly a distinguished personality, a significant problem in authorship, an important building, or an instructive quotation drawn from contemporary criticism. Consistent with its encyclopaedic scope the book is enriched with nearly four hundred clear illustrations, including many freshly drawn plans, a detailed list of the buildings illustrated, with the sources of the illustrations, and more than fifty pages of bibliographical references both contemporary and modern. With this store of information added to the source material collected by Hitchcock, Roos, the WPA guides and the Historic American Building Survey, research in the Pre-Civil-War period of American architecture could easily advance a great deal.

The need for such research is made very clear by Hamlin even within the scope of his book which he modestly calls an introduction to the subject. It should hardly be necessary to remind art historians of their duty to the art of their own time and of its immediate antecedents. Yet a reminder seems appropriate. With the exception of a very limited number of publications issuing from American colleges and universities, the task of investigating American art has remained in the hands of enthusiastic "non-academic" scholars who have little opportunity to crystallize their knowledge and methods into a tradition of scholarship through graduate students and facilities enjoyed by other fields of art history.

Those who see in modern architecture the final vindication of the industrial revolution or those who look upon revivals as parodies of noble original styles will have little sympathy with such research. But such an attitude ignores the meaning of the problem in the larger social and cultural frame. What seems from the viewpoint of modern "functionalist" objectivity a betrayal of the industrial revolution was part of a historical orientation which affected all aspects of the social and political fabric of the western world. As Hamlin aptly illustrates through the memoirs of Margaret Fuller, classical culture in many of its known phases was sincerely and intimately assimilated. Furthermore, the American architects—as Hamlin somewhat repetitiously points out—were not unimaginative adapters and copyists but artists who gave fresh meaning to a borrowed vocabulary. The large number of builders' guides published in America during this period reveals clearly the preoccupation of the designers with the varied transformations of the style. This is even more tangibly confirmed by the many delightful departures from classical syntax found in cosmopolitan and provincial houses illustrated in the book.

Despite its range of originality the Greek Revival was destined to give way to other historical styles. Hamlin thinks that its derivative nature paved the way for its disappearance; that Americans probably thought

that if one historical style could produce good architecture why not other styles? The question, however, was probably never asked at the end of the Greek Revival, for the future had been traced even at the birth of republican America and France. The first indecisive battle between Gothic and Classic had already been waged; French architects had already revived Renaissance architecture under the peculiar title "neo-grec" in order to succeed the Roman Revival; and Soane had made his significant project for a church designed in several alternative styles.

Whatever the arguments against the practice, the nineteenth century saw the future largely through the eyes of the past—especially in architecture—and if we are to understand the many interesting facets of its culture we must see them first through the sympathetic eyes of our Hamilins. Given Hamlin's unprejudiced point of view, the scholar of American culture will find in this book new avenues of research in regional problems and in individual architectural careers; the teacher of American social history a visible setting for his verbal generalizations; and the average American will discover that American art from the beginning of its national existence has participated creatively in an international culture.

DIMITRIS TSELOS

*New York University*

LEO VAN PUYVELDE. *The Dutch Drawings in the Collection of His Majesty the King at Windsor Castle*, 80 pp., 150 ill. New York, 1944, The Oxford University Press (Phaidon). \$5.50.

The collection of drawings of the Windsor Library has long been famous. Yet few, even among scholars, have known the varied treasures it contains. Many are familiar with the portrait drawings of Holbein and the Leonardo sketches. Of the thousands of Italian, French and Netherlandish drawings, there has not been, until recently, so much as a check list.

Once again the old adage about the ill wind has proved true. Professor van Puyvelde, Director of the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, finding himself an exile in England and a welcome visitor at Windsor, has catalogued first the Flemish and now the Dutch drawings. Two years ago, in the darkest days of the war, the Phaidon Press brought out his volume on the Flemish drawings. This year, using the same format, they have published a companion volume on the Dutch drawings.

The volume devoted to Flemish drawings listed, described, and discussed three hundred and seven drawings, reproducing one hundred and ten. The new Dutch volume following the same procedure, lists seven hundred and seventy-eight drawings, illustrating nearly one hundred and fifty. Happily, in spite of the increasing scarcity of paper, the reproductions of the Dutch drawings are much better than those in the Flemish catalogue. Some drawings such as the Ruysdaels and the Isaac von Ostade, are reproduced in full page plates which approach the size of the original drawings and even in halftones have that magic of light and atmosphere which is an



essential part of the charm of the originals. The small reproductions are clear.

A short introduction explains the history of the collection. Even a monarch with troublesome colonies could, in the eighteenth century, find time for quiet enjoyment. It was George III who added most generously to the drawing collection. And it was the Prince of Wales, later George IV, who purchased a large number of the Dutch drawings.

The personal taste of these royal collectors is clearly revealed and gives to the volume a flavor that is as attractive as it is understandable. They favored pictorial records of historical events, such as naval battles, royal embarkations and coronations. They enjoyed careful topographical drawings of foreign cities which presented their appearance with accuracy enlivened by delightful detail. They collected detailed recordings of the English campaigns in Holland in 1799 and 1801. An interest in the latter we can share today, particularly when we look at Dirk Langendyk's "Landing of English Troops in North Holland."

It is not surprising that the same collectors should have admired the grandly conceived and carefully composed Italianate landscapes of those seventeenth and eighteenth century Dutchmen who found their inspiration either in the Italian scene itself or in the paintings, drawings and engravings of others. Hackaert, Frederick de Moucheron, Schellincks, and Romeyn, whose drawings are illustrated in this catalogue, all drew in the Italianate manner.

Many other masters, including those who devoted themselves to homely Dutch scenes and to Dutch land and seascapes, are also well represented. Where else is there a comparable selection of the drawings of Hendrik Avercamp, the dumb artist of Kampen, who brings the busy and entertaining winter life of Holland to life before our eyes? In the twenty-six illustrations of his drawings, he can be seen tempering his keen observation with humor, as he records the affected bows of the dandies, the nonchalant ease of a proficient skater showing off, the steady application of a knife grinder surrounded by curious little boys.

Three beautiful portrait drawings by Lely are reproduced, one a portrait of Nell Gwyn.

The greatest name of Holland is, however, conspicuous by its absence. There is not a single Rembrandt. Professor van Puyvelde believes this to be a reflection of eighteenth century English taste. That brilliant economy of line in Rembrandt's sketches which appeals so strongly to us would not have appealed, he believes, to those cultivated connoisseurs of the eighteenth century who preferred more finished products. Less easy to understand is the lack of a single Renaissance drawing and the very few mannerist drawings; nor is there a Cuyp, a Hobbema, or a Savery.

To study Dutch art without a knowledge of the drawings of the Dutch masters, which were very often complete works in themselves, made for the portfolios of connoisseurs and not studies in preparations for paint-



ings, is to ignore not only a revealing facet of Dutch art and life, but to miss the delights of their sparkle, their mastery of atmospheric effects, their narrative gifts and their humor. Yet it has been difficult to know them. They have been little collected in this country. The best known scholarly catalogues which contain a wealth of reproductions—Lugt's three volumes on the Dutch drawings in the Louvre, Bock and Rosenberg's on those in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Hind and Popham's five volumes on the British Museum Drawings, Benesch's on those in the Albertina, Vienna, and Fairfax Murray's on the Morgan Library collection—are now not only hard to find but relatively expensive. For that reason alone this volume of very modest cost should prove useful to professors and students alike.

As for Professor van Puyvelde's text, one can at present only query his contention that Lambert Doomer's copy after Rembrandt's *Resurrection* (Munich) presents the original composition. One can doubt his solution of the de Gheyn problem and question a few attributions. A few more question marks in some cases might have made clearer his own hesitation. The portrait of Charles II given to van der Banck seems to be a counterproof and not the original drawing, and the Luyken's *Hanging at Flushing* appears to be after the engraving, not in preparation for it.

It may seem captious to make these points when the author makes no claim to completeness nor to absolute accuracy. Our admiration for his accomplishment in the face of the difficulties which the times presented is great.

AGNES MONGAN  
Fogg Museum

ALAN PRIEST, *Chinese Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (Photographs by Tet Borsig), 81 p., 132 pl. New York, 1944. The Museum. \$4.00.

This catalogue adds one more to the all too few publications treating the great collections of Chinese art in America. It provides a brief historical introduction outlining the major stages in the development of Chinese sculpture, and a descriptive catalogue of 79 objects belonging to the museum or on loan there. These objects and some rubbings of Han stones are illustrated on 132 halftone plates showing many details. There is an annotated list of 74 additional monuments the author considers important for the study of the subject; and a chronology and bibliography are included.

While it may be out of order to criticize a book for not being something its author did not mean it to be, an overall assessment of its value for the student of Chinese sculpture compels the following observation. In view of the fact that the bulk of the material is Buddhist and that the earlier periods are illustrated by only one Han stone and four rubbings of Han stones actually in China, and with such limited space at his disposal, the author could have improved his work by omitting discussion of the

pre-Buddhist periods and devoting those pages to notes on the religion itself, its history in India, its spread into Central Asia and China, and the pilgrims who kept alive the all-important transcontinental arteries of contact. As it is, he has not said enough to give the early periods a satisfactory introduction, and the main subject has been deprived of valuable space.

In spite of this general criticism, the book should prove a useful addition to the literature on the subject. The historical introduction, though too short, has the advantage of treating the subject through the Sung and Ming dynasties. This should help correct the widely held but erroneous impression that Buddhist sculpture in China ends with T'ang. It is liberally sprinkled with dates which enable the beginner to keep himself oriented. On the other hand he will find that too much has been taken for granted about his knowledge of Buddhism, knowledge that is prerequisite to a study of Buddhist sculpture.

Space does not permit a detailed analysis, but a few notes may be made on some points. The discussion of changes in style that took place in the various periods is well done for those who are willing to accept the formal development as an end in itself. In all religious art, however, changes in the spiritual temper of the people are fundamental in determining the superficial changes in the forms of the images they used for devotional purposes. To regard the development of style as an isolated phenomenon when dealing with Buddhist art is a basic error; and it is to be regretted that the author did not enrich his text with some indication of the underlying reasons for the changes he notes.

The catalogue proper discusses each object with respect to such details as date, style, iconography, comparative material, provenance, etc. The author is to be commended for the frankness with which he discusses some of the problem pieces, objects which have been subject to controversy among scholars. In placing these matters before the reader in unbiased fashion, he does much to encourage an open-minded approach to the subject. He is also quite candid in describing pieces that have been retouched. The iconographic remarks are, in general, useful; but their value would be still greater had he given his reasons or cited his sources for some of the identifications. Why, for instance, does he call the central Buddha of No. 25 Dipankara; and how does he justify his explanation of the lower left hand panel on the back of No. 33? Surely the latter is open to question; and a fuller documentation would have been welcome.

For years Mr. Priest has been a voice crying in the wilderness on the matter of Chinese wood sculpture. Here, with twenty-odd examples illustrated, he states his views on the subject. With four dated pieces as his strongpoints, he sets forth a body of evidence that demands the consideration of serious students. It is, of course, easy to dismiss his arguments with the assertion that the dates are spurious; but, under the circumstances, that is hardly justifiable. Attention should here be called to the author's remarks on p. 40 about scholars with closed minds. This is all too true.

There are far too many young people (and some not so young) who, having read a handful of the so-called authorities on Chinese art, stand ready to cry "fake" the moment they meet something unfamiliar.

In the chronology it should be noted that the date 1050 B.C. given for the beginning of the Chou dynasty, though it has recently been favored, is no longer considered tenable. The latest scholarship on this moot point tends to reaffirm the traditional date of 1122 B.C. (cf. Wu Ch'i-ch'ang: *Chin wen li shuo su cheng*, Shanghai 1936; and Tung Tso-pin: *The Fundamental Problems in the Study of the Chronology of the Yin Dynasty*, in the Fortieth Anniversary Papers of Peking National University, Kunning, 1940). The second footnote on the chronology is also misleading. The state of Ch'in effectively controlled China after 256 B.C., the last Chou king was killed in 249, and the Ch'in ruler took the title of Emperor (the first time it was used in China) in 221.

The bibliography could be much improved. Too many of the titles are out of date or only remotely related to the subject at hand. Many authors could be omitted altogether, among them Arlington, Bosshard, Bredon, Buck, Cordier, Hirth, Jackson, Legge, Lewisohn, Li Ung Bing, MacGowan, Minns, Rackham, Richard, Rostovtzeff, Timperley, and Wilhelm, without curtailing the usefulness of the list. On the other hand additional titles important to the subject should appear under the names of Chavannes, Coomaraswamy, and Grousset. Conspicuous by their total absence are such noted writers and translators of material on Buddhism and Buddhist art as S. Beal, H. Kern, H. Maspero, J. Takakusu, J. Ph. Vogel, J. R. Ware, and T. Watters.

JOHN A. POPE  
Freer Gallery

GISELA M. A. RICHTER, *Kouros, A Study of the Development of the Greek Kouros*, xxi + 428 p., 261 plates. New York, 1942, Oxford University Press, \$15.00.

Miss Richter, to whom we are indebted for such excellent basic works as *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks* and *Animals in Greek Sculpture*, is eminently qualified to undertake the study of the *kouros*, the standing male nude type—the so-called archaic Apollo type—that "runs through early Greek sculpture like a chief theme in music." The acquisition by the Metropolitan Museum of New York of its marble *kouros* provided the incentive for the study, which originally appeared in the form of a series of lectures, the Ryerson Memorial lectures, delivered at the Yale University Art Gallery in 1938. The present volume is an enlargement of those lectures.

The aim of the author is to trace the development of the *kouros* type from its first appearance in the seventh century to its final dissolution in the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. The long life-history of the *kouros* is characterized by a uniform and universal progression from an abstract

and geometric conception of form to complete naturalism not only in the general structure, but also in the rendering of the various parts. The 150 extant *kouroi*, scattered in the various museums of Europe and America and forming the body of the evidence, are distinguished in six different groups, separated from each other by a period of about 20 years. The anatomical details of the *kouroi* provide the criterion for this division, based on the belief that new discoveries and improvements became known to all sculptors almost at once and were equally shared by all. Thus a common progression along naturalistic lines resulted, that tended to obliterate regional characteristics. The various schools of sculpture, so dear to scholars, are eliminated, and only the broad division into eastern and western varieties is maintained. The members of each group, regardless of their provenance, exhibit the same degree of anatomical knowledge, are assumed to be almost contemporary, and their best preserved example provides the name for the group. Thus we have, The Sounion Group (c.615-590), the Orchomenos-Thera group (c.590-570), the Tenaea-Volamandra group (c.575-550), the Melos group (c.555-540), the Anavysos-Ptoon 12 (c.545-515), and the Ptoon 20 group (c.515-485). For each group are provided: (1) a historical background, (2) a discussion of absolute chronology, (3) anatomical analysis, and (4) a complete description of each extant example. The chronology of the groups, of course, can only be relative, but their sequence, based entirely upon anatomical considerations, is well and definitely established. This, we believe, is the main achievement of the author.

Perhaps the complete reliance on anatomical details and the belief that all developments became common stock almost at once, may be considered as dangerous. Yet all other available evidence seems to corroborate the conclusions reached by the author. It might be interesting to note that throughout the period of the *kouros* type, Attica, Boeotia, Samos, Naxos, and Delos seem to be important centers of sculpture. Corinth is represented by examples in two groups, and Argos is represented only by the famous twins of Delphi, that belong to the first group. The lack of other Argive works is remarkable, but even more remarkable is the absence of the island of Chios from the list. One wonders what was the relation of that island to the rest of the Eastern world, and what, in the scheme of sculptural development of the Archaic period, was the place of the famous *Korae* of the Acropolis, reputedly done by or under the influence of Chian masters. If we could judge from the extant *kouri*, Samos seems to be the great eastern sculptural center and not Chios. Is that perhaps due to the fact that Chios has not been fully explored as yet?

The importance of the eastern Greek section to sculpture is indicated in the introductory remarks of our author; there it is suggested that stone sculpture was initiated in that section and not in Crete. The claim is based on two stone *kouroi* discovered in the island of Delos, and believed to be the earliest extant stone statues. But their date seems to depend entirely

on their primitive anatomical details. Since, as our author states, "there must have been progressives and conservatives among Greek artists as there are today," could we not assume that the two *kouroi* from Delos were the work of such conservative artists? Stylistically their work would belong with the earliest group; chronologically, however, they could be much later than many examples more advanced. Hence their evidence alone cannot prove the claim.

The earliest extant *kouroi* go back to the seventh century. Before that time wood may have been used for sculpture. The discovery of geometric temples seems to indicate the existence of wooden statues in the early historic years. Sir Arthur Evans has suggested that wood was used in Minoan days and by the Cretans for their monumental sculpture. Will that indicate that an older tradition underlies wood sculpturing in Greece?

In her work the author was ably assisted by Miss Irma A. Richter. Two hundred eight photographs, out of a total of 483, were contributed by Gerard M. Young. The high quality of these photographs, typical of the work of the director of the British School at Athens, and the typography in general leave nothing to be desired. The only errors we were able to detect are on page 220 where the references to figures 478-480 do not seem to agree with the numbers on plate 261.

The study, in general, exhibits the same scholarly and masterly approach, the same painstaking and penetrating method that characterize the efforts of Miss Richter. It does provide a model to be followed in the pursuit of knowledge. Scholars will be grateful to its author for this new monumental contribution, which will have a strong appeal to those who specialize in Ancient Greek sculpture. The first four chapters (pp. 1-46) will prove of interest to the general student of art.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS  
Washington University

Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, *Russian Icons and Objects of Ecclesiastical and Decorative Arts from the Collection of George R. Hann*, Text by A. Avinov, 29 p. + Catalogue Entries for 252 items, 19 pl. (1 in color). Pittsburgh, 1944, The Carnegie Institute. \$1.00.

*Rossica non leguntur*. The old Latin saying unfortunately stands even today, very much to the disadvantage of students of the history of art, which with regard to Russia reminds one of an old geographical map: white spots mark the unexplored areas. Actually, in the light of Russian art traditional aesthetic standards no less than historic concepts are bound to be revised. To anyone who has seen the incomparable Old Testament *Trinity* by the fifteenth century painter monk, Andrei Rublov, in the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow, his contemporary Fra Angelico appears almost garish. Moreover, Russia has placed a tremendous part in the process of integrating Eastern and Western, Mediterranean and Nordic



art forms, a process which has been going on in Europe with ever increasing intensity since the downfall of the Roman empire. That is why every step taken in the direction of adding to our knowledge of Russian art is to be welcomed. The exhibition of the splendid Hann Collection deserves special credit for its valuable catalogue. Its illustrations are clear and large enough to allow serious study. Each exhibit is carefully described; iconographic problems are elucidated and attributions are made with an impressive knowledge. However, the most outstanding feature of the catalogue is an introduction by A. Avinov. The author has done more than comment on the art objects of the Hann Collection; he has also given us an introduction to icon painting in general—all in a nutshell.

There is no concise treatment of the subject in English. Kondakov's standard work, *The Russian Icon*, is available in an excellent English translation (Oxford, 1927) but it is a heavy and intricate, somewhat dated book. Mikhail Alpatov, a very competent younger Russian author, wrote a volume on icons which forms part of a comprehensive German work on Russian art, *Geschichte der altrussischen Kunst* (Augsburg, 1932), but his theories are not always convincing. The German professor, Philipp Schweinfurth, published a ponderous volume on icon painting, *Geschichte der russischen Malerei im Mittelalter* (Hague, 1930), which is valuable as a compilation of sources rather than as an interpretation of a fascinating world of art. Perhaps the best treatment of the subject in a Western language is a book by the eminent Russian connoisseur, Paul Muratov, which appeared in French under the title: *Les Icones Russes* (Paris, 1927). Numerous articles on detailed problems and some impressive picture books have appeared outside Russia, but they do not make up for the lack of a "handbook."

In this catalogue there is not space for more than a summary treatment of the vast field, and its usefulness for reference is impaired seriously through the lack of a bibliography. The author writes like a sensitive art critic rather than like an academic specialist, although he sometimes allows himself to be lured into a kind of esoteric journalism. Thus he characterizes the tradition of a late school of icon painters as "refracted through some bizarre Iranian prisms and touched by a Daliesque persistence of memories of priceless Byzantine enamels." His method of studying Russian icon painting in close connection with the history of the art of Byzantium is commendable; his pointers to the distinction between the various schools of icon painting are most helpful, although he has to cope here with some unsolved problems; and his evaluations of periods and masters are sound. Whether the theories about the origin of icon painting in Egyptian mummy portraits, which are quoted approvingly, are correct or need some modifications remains to be seen. One could argue also with Avinov's orthodox views on the art of Novgorod. The imaginative, individual and colorful style of the Novgorod school of icon painters might

be explained rather by Nordic than by Byzantine influences. However, these are points for discussion rather than for criticism. Avinov's introduction is stimulating and challenging.

One word about the selection of objects of decorative arts in the catalogue: they are uneven and do not give an adequate idea of the range of the Russian craftsman. Some weak, eclectic pieces of nineteenth century origin clash with the serene grandeur of excellent medieval enamels.

WOLFGANG BORN  
Queens College

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*The Drawings of Paul Klee*, with Introduction by Will Grohmann (Translation by Mimi Catlin and Margit von Ternes), xv p., 72 collotype pl., in portfolio. New York, 1944, Curt Valentin. \$15.00.

*Pedagogical Sketch Book*, by Paul Klee (Translation by Sibyl Peech), 65 p., 87 ill. New York, 1944, The Nierendorf Gallery.

*Married Life*, by Honoré Daumier, 24 lithographs reproduced by heliogravure, in portfolio. No text. New York, 1944, Pantheon Books. \$5.50.

*Lyonel Feininger—Marsden Hartley* (Edited by Dorothy C. Miller and Munroe Wheeler, Essays by Alfred H. Barr and Alois J. Schardt, Selected Statements by the Artists), a catalogue of an exhibition, 96 p., ill. New York, 1944, The Museum of Modern Art. \$2.50.